

Course-Section: POLI 100 1  
 Title Amer Govt & Politics  
 Instructor: Miller, Nicholas  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1209  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	9	0	0	2	13	13	10	3.82	1280/1509	4.06	4.44	4.31	4.18	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	2	9	12	16	4.08	1034/1509	4.01	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	2	1	6	11	19	4.13	869/1287	3.93	4.40	4.30	4.24	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	3	0	2	9	10	15	4.06	945/1459	3.69	4.28	4.22	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	7	6	9	16	3.89	941/1406	4.15	4.42	4.09	4.02	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	4	6	11	17	4.00	807/1384	3.72	4.35	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	3	4	4	9	19	3.95	1058/1489	4.04	4.34	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	1	0	15	21	4.51	1062/1506	4.68	4.64	4.67	4.66	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	0	1	12	14	5	3.72	1133/1463	3.94	4.10	4.09	4.02	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	8	26	4.62	646/1438	4.61	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	2	2	5	28	4.59	1091/1421	4.78	4.77	4.73	4.66	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	7	9	20	4.27	867/1411	4.11	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	6	6	21	4.14	980/1405	4.25	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	7	0	3	7	8	10	3.89	779/1236	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.87	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	4	2	8	4	4	3.09	1149/1260	3.57	4.27	4.14	3.95	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	2	1	10	5	4	3.36	1161/1255	3.70	4.44	4.33	4.15	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	3	8	10	4.18	856/1258	4.35	4.61	4.38	4.18	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	26	19	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	2.85	4.00	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	6	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	16	General	11	Under-grad	47	Non-major	37
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100 2  
 Title Amer Govt & Politics  
 Instructor: Miller, Nicholas  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1210  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	0	1	10	14	17	4.12	1032/1509	4.06	4.44	4.31	4.18	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	13	10	16	3.93	1148/1509	4.01	4.32	4.26	4.25	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	7	14	15	3.88	1031/1287	3.93	4.40	4.30	4.24	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	10	13	15	3.95	1033/1459	3.69	4.28	4.22	4.11	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	4	9	8	14	3.55	1159/1406	4.15	4.42	4.09	4.02	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	10	10	17	3.98	846/1384	3.72	4.35	4.11	3.98	3.98
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	9	9	20	4.10	923/1489	4.04	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	17	23	4.51	1062/1506	4.68	4.64	4.67	4.66	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	8	17	7	3.85	1021/1463	3.94	4.10	4.09	4.02	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	11	26	4.59	700/1438	4.61	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	7	30	4.72	950/1421	4.78	4.77	4.73	4.66	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	8	11	16	4.05	1025/1411	4.11	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	5	11	20	4.23	911/1405	4.25	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	2	2	9	6	10	3.69	893/1236	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.87	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	4	2	9	6	4	3.16	1139/1260	3.57	4.27	4.14	3.95	3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	5	6	3	10	3.64	1090/1255	3.70	4.44	4.33	4.15	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	802/1258	4.35	4.61	4.38	4.18	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	19	17	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	****/ 873	2.85	4.00	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	6	A 10	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 17			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 10	General 9	Under-grad 44	Non-major 31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

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	18	0	1	3	3	7	11	3.96	1154/1509	4.06	4.44	4.31	4.18	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	18	0	1	3	4	6	11	3.92	1148/1509	4.01	4.32	4.26	4.25	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	18	0	2	1	4	13	5	3.72	1101/1287	3.93	4.40	4.30	4.24	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	18	3	4	2	7	6	3	3.09	1412/1459	3.69	4.28	4.22	4.11	3.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	332/1406	4.15	4.42	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	19	1	2	3	7	8	3	3.30	1277/1384	3.72	4.35	4.11	3.98	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	1	2	3	8	10	4.00	986/1489	4.04	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	1	0	0	1	22	4.79	794/1506	4.68	4.64	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	831/1463	3.94	4.10	4.09	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	2	1	6	15	4.42	917/1438	4.61	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	588/1421	4.78	4.77	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	2	3	8	10	4.00	1051/1411	4.11	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	2	0	9	12	4.21	934/1405	4.25	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	0	2	0	6	10	5	3.70	888/1236	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.87	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	6	7	9	3.92	856/1260	3.57	4.27	4.14	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	6	10	6	3.75	1054/1255	3.70	4.44	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	742/1258	4.35	4.61	4.38	4.18	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	19	15	2	2	4	0	1	2.56	****/ 873	2.85	4.00	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	1	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	2	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	3	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	3	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 3  
 Title Amer Govt & Politics  
 Instructor: King-Meadows,Ty  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1211  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	43	Non-major	35
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 100 4  
 Title Amer Govt & Politics  
 Instructor: King-Meadows,Ty  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1212  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	1	4	11	18	4.35	778/1509	4.06	4.44	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	3	6	9	16	4.12	1002/1509	4.01	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	3	6	13	12	4.00	924/1287	3.93	4.40	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	3	2	1	8	14	6	3.68	1233/1459	3.69	4.28	4.22	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	7	25	4.65	238/1406	4.15	4.42	4.09	4.02	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	10	2	2	7	6	7	3.58	1154/1384	3.72	4.35	4.11	3.98	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	2	2	5	6	19	4.12	906/1489	4.04	4.34	4.17	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	524/1506	4.68	4.64	4.67	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	5	14	9	4.14	750/1463	3.94	4.10	4.09	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	348/1438	4.61	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	33	4.94	322/1421	4.78	4.77	4.73	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	6	13	13	4.12	985/1411	4.11	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	3	7	22	4.41	745/1405	4.25	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	1	4	11	17	4.24	504/1236	3.88	3.98	4.00	3.87	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	3	14	13	4.12	701/1260	3.57	4.27	4.14	3.95	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	4	5	9	15	4.06	886/1255	3.70	4.44	4.33	4.15	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	5	4	24	4.58	570/1258	4.35	4.61	4.38	4.18	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	3	5	8	0	4	2.85	838/ 873	2.85	4.00	4.03	3.89	2.85
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 4  
 Title Amer Govt & Politics  
 Instructor: King-Meadows,Ty  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1212  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	18	General	9	Under-grad	44	Non-major	37
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 209 1  
 Title Sel Topics In Poli  
 Instructor: Hoffman,David B  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1213  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	0	1	0	3	3	14	4.38	745/1509	4.38	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	667/1509	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	12	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	2	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	432/1459	4.53	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	423/1406	4.42	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	403/1384	4.45	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	781/1489	4.24	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	567/1463	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	631/1438	4.63	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	562/1421	4.89	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	327/1411	4.74	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	165/1260	4.87	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1255	4.93	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.61	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 209 1  
 Title Sel Topics In Poli  
 Instructor: Hoffman, David B  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1213  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						



Course-Section: POLI 210 1  
 Title Political Philosophy  
 Instructor: Carter, John  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1214  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	0	0	0	2	11	20	4.55	551/1509	4.61	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	24	4.52	531/1509	4.56	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	23	4.58	453/1287	4.65	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	9	5	18	4.28	737/1459	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	22	4.64	246/1406	4.66	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	394/1384	4.27	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	21	4.53	422/1489	4.55	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	583/1506	4.95	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	3	16	5	4.08	809/1463	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	396/1438	4.82	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	27	4.73	933/1421	4.77	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	416/1411	4.60	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	26	4.70	419/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	2	4	6	9	3.91	774/1236	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.11	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	621/1260	4.28	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	443/1255	4.51	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	274/1258	4.67	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	498/ 873	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 210 1  
 Title Political Philosophy  
 Instructor: Carter, John  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1214  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	33	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 210 2  
 Title Political Philosophy  
 Instructor: Carter, John  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1215  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	398/1509	4.61	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	424/1509	4.56	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	304/1287	4.65	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	619/1459	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	215/1406	4.66	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	5	7	12	4.08	767/1384	4.27	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	376/1489	4.55	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.64	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	3	9	7	4.00	853/1463	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	291/1438	4.82	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	742/1421	4.77	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	580/1411	4.60	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	446/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	2	0	5	2	5	3.57	950/1236	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.11	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	574/1260	4.28	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	3	1	12	4.35	707/1255	4.51	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	650/1258	4.67	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	394/ 873	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 0					

Course-Section: POLI 233 1  
 Title Common Law&Legal Analy  
 Instructor: Miller,Kerwin  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1216  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	458/1509	4.63	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	14	18	4.52	531/1509	4.52	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	199/1287	4.81	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	1	0	0	6	19	4.62	335/1459	4.62	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	103/1406	4.88	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	7	22	4.58	292/1384	4.58	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	7	24	4.61	341/1489	4.61	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	19	12	4.39	1177/1506	4.39	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	1	9	13	4.42	452/1463	4.42	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	7	24	4.66	603/1438	4.66	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	215/1421	4.97	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	402/1411	4.68	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	28	4.81	273/1405	4.81	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	20	3	0	1	1	6	3.64	920/1236	3.64	3.98	4.00	4.11	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	344/1260	4.62	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	287/1255	4.81	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	189/1258	4.92	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	8	15	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	91/ 873	4.82	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 233 1  
 Title Common Law&Legal Analy  
 Instructor: Miller,Kerwin  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1216  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	19	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 240 1  
 Title State & Local Politics  
 Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1217  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	17	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	574/1509	4.45	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	519/1509	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	614/1287	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	792/1459	4.21	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	3	3	14	4.38	462/1406	4.48	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	440/1384	4.34	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	18	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	151/1489	4.68	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	1	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	1177/1506	4.15	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	222/1463	4.46	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	291/1438	4.93	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	665/1421	4.93	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	556/1411	4.69	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	432/1405	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	193/1236	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.11	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	574/1260	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	638/1255	4.66	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	620/1258	4.69	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	442/ 873	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	38	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 240 2  
 Title State & Local Politics  
 Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1218  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	16	0	1	1	2	4	16	4.38	756/1509	4.45	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	574/1509	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	0	1	0	1	7	16	4.48	542/1287	4.45	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	1	1	1	3	6	12	4.17	851/1459	4.21	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	281/1406	4.48	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	13	10	4.28	589/1384	4.34	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	1	0	0	7	17	4.56	387/1489	4.68	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	6	13	4	3.91	1441/1506	4.15	4.64	4.67	4.61	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	608/1463	4.46	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1438	4.93	4.52	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1421	4.93	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	232/1411	4.69	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	596/1405	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	1	2	1	6	11	4.14	580/1236	4.39	3.98	4.00	4.11	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	294/1260	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.19	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	229/1255	4.66	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	274/1258	4.69	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	2	0	1	5	6	3.93	517/ 873	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.93
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	40
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	Other	0
			I 0		
			? 1		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 250 1  
 Title Intro To Public Admin  
 Instructor: Johnson,Arthur  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1219  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	10	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1114/1509	4.07	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1306/1509	3.94	4.32	4.26	4.32	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	1	3	0	3	5	3.67	1118/1287	4.06	4.40	4.30	4.35	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	8	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1459	****	4.28	4.22	4.30	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	1105/1406	3.83	4.42	4.09	4.09	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.35	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	1	2	0	4	5	3.83	1155/1489	4.17	4.34	4.17	4.19	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	883/1506	4.61	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1187/1463	3.86	4.10	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	1071/1438	4.48	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	716/1421	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1135/1411	4.28	4.33	4.31	4.37	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	4	5	3.83	1163/1405	4.17	4.47	4.32	4.39	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	2	2	1	3	2	3.10	1116/1236	3.34	3.98	4.00	4.11	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	924/1260	3.78	4.27	4.14	4.19	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1001/1255	3.89	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	834/1258	4.22	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	865/ 873	2.17	4.00	4.03	4.04	2.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: POLI 250 2  
 Title Intro To Public Admin  
 Instructor: Johnson,Arthur  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1220  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	27	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	998/1509	4.07	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	27	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	901/1509	3.94	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	28	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	566/1287	4.06	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	27	7	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	****/1459	****	4.28	4.22	4.30	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	813/1406	3.83	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	27	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1384	****	4.35	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	27	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	458/1489	4.17	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	27	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1070/1506	4.61	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	809/1463	3.86	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	514/1438	4.48	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	828/1421	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	442/1411	4.28	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	634/1405	4.17	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	2	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	945/1236	3.34	3.98	4.00	4.11	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	****/1260	3.78	4.27	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	****/1255	3.89	4.44	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/1258	4.22	4.61	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	3	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 873	2.17	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	2.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: POLI 260 1  
 Title Comparative Politics  
 Instructor: Grodsky, Brian  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1221  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	12	17	4.39	734/1509	4.41	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	5	14	14	4.27	838/1509	4.06	4.32	4.26	4.32	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	1	1	11	12	8	3.76	1091/1287	3.55	4.40	4.30	4.35	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	15	0	2	4	7	5	3.83	1143/1459	3.83	4.28	4.22	4.30	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	7	6	19	4.30	527/1406	4.24	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	22	1	1	6	2	1	3.09	****/1384	****	4.35	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	0	4	2	27	4.70	243/1489	4.52	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	408/1506	4.93	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	0	1	6	10	7	3.96	918/1463	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.08	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	4	5	22	4.58	700/1438	4.66	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	716/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	6	6	18	4.32	820/1411	4.29	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	4	6	18	4.19	940/1405	4.28	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	1	1	4	9	12	4.11	607/1236	4.15	3.98	4.00	4.11	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	2	6	8	5	3.42	1086/1260	3.56	4.27	4.14	4.19	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	3	6	7	8	3.83	1023/1255	3.94	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	742/1258	4.46	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	23	7	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	575/ 873	3.70	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.82
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	2.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 12	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	Under-grad	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1	Non-major	30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

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	19	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	686/1509	4.41	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	0	4	4	12	8	3.86	1196/1509	4.06	4.32	4.26	4.32	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	4	3	10	5	8	3.33	1204/1287	3.55	4.40	4.30	4.35	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	19	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	****/1459	3.83	4.28	4.22	4.30	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	2	4	6	16	4.17	674/1406	4.24	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	20	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	****/1384	****	4.35	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	1	0	3	10	16	4.33	674/1489	4.52	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	408/1506	4.93	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	1	0	4	16	3	3.83	1036/1463	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	480/1438	4.66	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	1	0	3	26	4.80	794/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	1	3	9	16	4.27	876/1411	4.29	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	6	3	20	4.37	798/1405	4.28	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	1	1	1	5	5	15	4.19	545/1236	4.15	3.98	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	0	5	8	5	3.70	964/1260	3.56	4.27	4.14	4.19	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	1	5	2	11	4.05	889/1255	3.94	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	584/1258	4.46	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	29	6	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	681/ 873	3.70	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.57
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0	Major 22
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 49	Non-major 27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 2			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 2			

Course-Section: POLI 280 1  
 Title International Relation  
 Instructor: Hody,Cynthia A  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1223  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	17	0	0	3	2	9	16	4.27	872/1509	4.27	4.44	4.31	4.34	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	0	6	4	11	9	3.77	1252/1509	3.77	4.32	4.26	4.32	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	2	2	4	7	15	4.03	911/1287	4.03	4.40	4.30	4.35	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	2	1	2	3	8	14	4.14	877/1459	4.14	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	377/1406	4.47	4.42	4.09	4.09	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	5	1	2	4	7	11	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.35	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	2	2	5	12	9	3.80	1176/1489	3.80	4.34	4.17	4.19	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	17	13	4.43	1137/1506	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.61	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	2	3	3	13	6	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	4.10	4.09	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	4	5	7	10	3.68	1341/1438	3.68	4.52	4.46	4.48	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	429/1421	4.93	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	3	3	3	9	10	3.71	1218/1411	3.71	4.33	4.31	4.37	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	1	5	9	8	3.50	1265/1405	3.50	4.47	4.32	4.39	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	7	4	3	5	3	5	3.10	1116/1236	3.10	3.98	4.00	4.11	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	4	4	3	10	3.54	1031/1260	3.54	4.27	4.14	4.19	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	0	6	16	4.46	620/1255	4.46	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	2	2	6	14	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.61	4.38	4.44	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	24	18	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0	Major 18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 47	Non-major 29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 2			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 300 1  
 Title Quant Poli Sci  
 Instructor: Miller, Nicholas  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1224  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	26	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1072/1509	4.06	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	26	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	26	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	463/1287	4.56	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	3	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	868/1459	4.15	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	27	2	1	1	5	0	6	3.69	1087/1406	3.69	4.42	4.09	4.12	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	27	6	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	****/1384	****	4.35	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	27	0	1	3	5	1	5	3.40	1343/1489	3.40	4.34	4.17	4.14	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	27	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1046/1506	4.53	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	****/1463	****	4.10	4.09	4.08	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	646/1438	4.63	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	701/1411	4.44	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	683/1405	4.47	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	2	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	****/1260	****	4.27	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/1255	****	4.44	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/1258	****	4.61	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 42	Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: POLI 301 1  
 Title Poli Research Methods  
 Instructor: Dasgupta, Sunil  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1225  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	0	5	0	1	2	1	2.33	1505/1509	2.33	4.44	4.31	4.32	2.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	2	0	0	1.75	1508/1509	1.75	4.32	4.26	4.25	1.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1287	****	4.40	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	2	0	2	0	1.89	1459/1459	1.89	4.28	4.22	4.26	1.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	0	3	1	2.67	1381/1406	2.67	4.42	4.09	4.12	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	2	3	0	2.44	1374/1384	2.44	4.35	4.11	4.15	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	5	0	1	1	0	1.71	1485/1489	1.71	4.34	4.17	4.14	1.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1340/1506	4.11	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	6	2	1	0	0	1.44	1459/1463	1.44	4.10	4.09	4.08	1.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	3	1	0	0	1.56	1436/1438	1.56	4.52	4.46	4.43	1.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1303/1421	4.22	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	1	1	0	0	1.33	1410/1411	1.33	4.33	4.31	4.29	1.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	1	1	0	1.67	1403/1405	1.67	4.47	4.32	4.32	1.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	****	3.98	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	1	1	0	2.14	1254/1260	2.14	4.27	4.14	4.22	2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1232/1255	2.75	4.44	4.33	4.37	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	2.00	1255/1258	2.00	4.61	4.38	4.42	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	869/ 873	1.75	4.00	4.03	4.08	1.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 309 1  
 Title Selected Topics In Pol  
 Instructor: Thompson, Terry  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1226  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	574/1509	4.52	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	337/1287	4.68	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	313/1459	4.64	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	187/1406	4.71	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	334/1384	4.52	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	330/1489	4.62	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	618/1463	4.26	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	537/1421	4.91	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	232/1411	4.82	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	1	17	4.52	261/1236	4.52	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	2	15	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	2	1	14	4.32	740/1255	4.32	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	486/1258	4.70	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	130/ 873	4.71	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 315 1  
 Title Political Phil From 16  
 Instructor: Vetter, Lisa Pac  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1227  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	6	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	184/1509	4.88	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	1	1	21	4.71	311/1509	4.71	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	7	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	381/1287	4.65	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	45/1406	4.96	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	115/1384	4.79	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	364/1489	4.58	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	742/1506	4.83	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	301/1463	4.53	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	531/1438	4.71	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	3	1	19	4.58	520/1411	4.58	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	297/1405	4.79	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	630/1236	4.08	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	136/1260	4.90	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	123/1255	4.95	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	142/1258	4.95	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	169/ 873	4.63	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.63
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	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	30	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						



Course-Section: POLI 334 1  
 Title: Judicial Process  
 Instructor: Miller, Kerwin  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1228  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	9	12	4.35	676/1459	4.35	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	19	4.71	193/1406	4.71	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	5	13	4.17	693/1384	4.17	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	364/1489	4.58	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	334/1438	4.83	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	483/1421	4.91	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	267/1411	4.78	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	369/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	244/1260	4.75	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	254/1255	4.85	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	486/1258	4.69	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General		2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		3				
				?	1							

Course-Section: POLI 353 1  
 Title Governmental Budgeting  
 Instructor: Meyers, Roy T  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1229  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	574/1509	4.52	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	828/1509	4.29	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	13	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1036/1287	3.88	4.40	4.30	4.33	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	667/1459	4.35	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	486/1406	4.35	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	313/1384	4.55	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	3	8	3	5	3.40	1343/1489	3.40	4.34	4.17	4.14	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	5	12	3	3.90	1448/1506	3.90	4.64	4.67	4.67	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	714/1463	4.18	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	617/1438	4.65	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	950/1411	4.18	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	6	8	4.06	1024/1405	4.06	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	969/1236	3.54	3.98	4.00	4.07	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	722/1260	4.07	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	707/1255	4.36	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	756/1258	4.36	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major 26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: POLI 354 1  
 Title: Publ Mgmt/Personnel S  
 Instructor: Johnson, Arthur  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1230  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	872/1509	4.27	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	491/1287	4.53	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	8	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	****/1459	****	4.28	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	313/1406	4.53	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	10	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1384	****	4.35	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	1	1	1	2	0	9	4.15	865/1489	4.15	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1187/1463	3.64	4.10	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	981/1438	4.36	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	1037/1421	4.64	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	683/1405	4.46	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	964/1236	3.55	3.98	4.00	4.07	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	582/1260	4.30	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	749/1255	4.30	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 360 1  
 Title Comprtive Poli Analysi  
 Instructor: Gilbert, Leah E (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1231  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	483/1509	4.55	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	748/1459	4.28	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	216/1489	4.72	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1013/1463	2.56	4.10	4.09	4.08	2.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	131/1438	3.14	4.52	4.46	4.43	3.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	322/1421	3.25	4.77	4.73	4.73	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	389/1411	3.12	4.33	4.31	4.29	3.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	369/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	3	0	2	2	12	4.05	640/1236	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	323/1260	4.65	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	402/1255	4.71	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	337/1258	4.82	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	344/ 873	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.24

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 360 1  
 Title Comprtive Poli Analysi  
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Sunil (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1232  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	483/1509	4.55	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	748/1459	4.28	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	216/1489	4.72	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.64	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	6	2	0	0	0	1.25	1461/1463	2.56	4.10	4.09	4.08	2.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	7	1	1	0	0	1.33	1437/1438	3.14	4.52	4.46	4.43	3.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	6	2	0	1	0	1.56	1421/1421	3.25	4.77	4.73	4.73	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	7	0	1	1	0	1.56	1408/1411	3.12	4.33	4.31	4.29	3.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	6	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	323/1260	4.65	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	402/1255	4.71	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	337/1258	4.82	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	344/ 873	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.24

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
					Other 1

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 373 1  
 Title Comp Mid-East/N Afr Po  
 Instructor: Croatti,Mark  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1233  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	95/1509	4.95	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	17	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	200/1406	4.70	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	151/1489	4.80	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	602/1506	4.89	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	57/1463	4.94	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	131/1438	4.95	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	19	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	182/1236	4.65	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	172/1260	4.85	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	412/1255	4.70	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	4	0	10	4.06	427/ 873	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.06
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

Course-Section: POLI 380 1  
 Title International Relation  
 Instructor: Hody,Cynthia A  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1234  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	7	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	688/1287	4.36	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	2	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	378/1459	4.58	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	261/1406	4.62	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	403/1384	4.45	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1014/1506	4.57	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	424/1463	4.44	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	839/1438	4.48	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	269/1421	4.95	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	7	3	11	4.19	936/1411	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	671/1405	4.48	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	13	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	194/1260	4.82	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	463/1255	4.65	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	261/1258	4.88	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	765/ 873	3.29	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 17	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major 14
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: POLI 395 1  
 Title U.S. Nat'l Security Po  
 Instructor: Starkey, Brigid  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1235  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	227/1509	4.83	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	519/1509	4.52	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	370/1287	4.65	4.40	4.30	4.33	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	356/1459	4.59	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	294/1406	4.57	4.42	4.09	4.12	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	412/1384	4.43	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	387/1489	4.57	4.34	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	925/1506	4.68	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	452/1463	4.41	4.10	4.09	4.08	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	348/1438	4.82	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	269/1421	4.95	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	273/1405	4.82	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	1	0	5	2	4	3.67	904/1236	3.67	3.98	4.00	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	486/1258	4.70	4.61	4.38	4.42	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	366/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 28	Non-major 16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			



Course-Section: POLI 405 1  
 Title Seminar In Political S  
 Instructor: King-Meadows,Ty  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1236  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.40	4.30	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.42	4.09	4.11	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.34	4.17	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.10	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.52	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.98	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.61	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.67	4.54	4.83	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	61/ 90	4.33	4.33	4.50	4.69	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.64	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	69/ 93	3.67	3.67	4.06	4.32	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 409 1  
 Title Selected Topics Poli S  
 Instructor: Grodsky, Brian  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1237  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	176/1509	4.94	4.44	4.31	4.39	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	136/1459	4.91	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	99/1406	4.88	4.42	4.09	4.11	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	99/1384	4.81	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	1	11	4.29	717/1489	4.65	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	832/1506	4.88	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	241/1463	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	262/1438	4.88	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	389/1411	4.69	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	306/1236	4.46	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.27	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1255	4.80	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1258	4.83	4.61	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	93/ 873	4.90	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 409 2  
 Title Selected Topics Poli S  
 Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1238  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.94	4.44	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	5.00	4.40	4.30	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	4.91	4.28	4.22	4.32	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	4.88	4.42	4.09	4.11	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	107/1384	4.81	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	4.65	4.34	4.17	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.64	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1438	4.88	4.52	4.46	4.50	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	4.94	4.77	4.73	4.76	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1411	4.69	4.33	4.31	4.35	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.34	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	4.46	3.98	4.00	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260	4.83	4.27	4.14	4.25	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.80	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.83	4.61	4.38	4.51	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.90	4.00	4.03	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 425 1  
 Title US Campaigns & Electio  
 Instructor: Schaller,Thomas  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1239  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	95/1509	4.95	4.44	4.31	4.39	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	124/1509	4.89	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	293/1287	4.72	4.40	4.30	4.38	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	258/1459	4.68	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	287/1406	4.58	4.42	4.09	4.11	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	208/1384	4.68	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	254/1489	4.68	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	278/1463	4.56	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	73/1236	4.89	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	95/1260	4.94	4.27	4.14	4.25	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	350/1258	4.81	4.61	4.38	4.51	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	1							

Course-Section: POLI 446 1  
 Title The Politics Of Povert  
 Instructor: Hussey,Laura S.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1240  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	4	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	872/1509	4.27	4.44	4.31	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1228/1509	3.80	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.40	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	885/1459	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	313/1406	4.53	4.42	4.09	4.11	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	385/1384	4.47	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	896/1506	4.71	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	396/1463	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	520/1411	4.58	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	558/1405	4.58	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	984/1236	3.50	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.27	4.14	4.25	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.61	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.33	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	3.67	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: POLI 446 1  
 Title The Politics Of Povert  
 Instructor: Hussey, Laura S.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1240  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 488 1  
 Title Politics/Ir South Asia  
 Instructor: Hagerty, Devin T  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1241  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	176/1509	4.88	4.44	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	378/1509	4.65	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	191/1287	4.82	4.40	4.30	4.38	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	324/1459	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	366/1406	4.47	4.42	4.09	4.11	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	434/1489	4.53	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1364/1506	4.06	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	131/1438	4.94	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	83/1411	4.94	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1405	4.94	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	853/1236	3.75	3.98	4.00	4.03	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	460/1260	4.45	4.27	4.14	4.25	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	620/1255	4.45	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.91	4.61	4.38	4.51	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 4
84-150	1	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 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: POLI 489 1  
 Title Sel Topics: Internatl R  
 Instructor: Hagerty, Devin T  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1242  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1509	4.96	4.44	4.31	4.39	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.88	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	175/1287	4.90	4.40	4.30	4.38	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	5	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1459	4.68	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	261/1406	4.81	4.42	4.09	4.11	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	225/1384	4.81	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	330/1489	4.72	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	2	11	0	3.85	1458/1506	4.37	4.64	4.67	4.67	3.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1463	4.70	4.10	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.52	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1411	4.97	4.33	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	421/1236	4.17	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	712/1260	4.43	4.27	4.14	4.25	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1255	4.82	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	528/1258	4.79	4.61	4.38	4.51	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	4.64	4.00	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: POLI 489 2  
 Title Sel Topics: Internatl R  
 Instructor: Starkey, Brigid  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1243  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1509	4.96	4.44	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.32	4.26	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	76/1287	4.90	4.40	4.30	4.38	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	209/1459	4.68	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1406	4.81	4.42	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	43/1384	4.81	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	139/1489	4.72	4.34	4.17	4.18	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	622/1506	4.37	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	467/1463	4.70	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.52	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	322/1421	4.97	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	83/1411	4.97	4.33	4.31	4.35	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	664/1236	4.17	3.98	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	237/1260	4.43	4.27	4.14	4.25	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1255	4.82	4.44	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	165/1258	4.79	4.61	4.38	4.51	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	160/ 873	4.64	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major 9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 0					