

Course-Section: POLI 100 0101
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1208
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4	3	8	12	3.83	1234/1504	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.13	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	13	4.10	990/1503	4.22	4.31	4.20	4.16	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	3	6	15	4.15	901/1453	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.11	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	5	4	14	3.79	947/1421	3.99	4.33	4.00	3.91	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	9	11	3.72	1025/1365	3.96	4.15	4.08	3.96	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	21	4.45	536/1485	4.48	4.41	4.16	4.13	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	5	13	9	4.15	1353/1504	4.63	4.55	4.69	4.66	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	7	11	2	3.75	1123/1483	4.28	4.32	4.06	3.97	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	8	17	4.41	888/1425	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.36	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	825/1426	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	6	6	14	4.03	1003/1418	4.36	4.41	4.25	4.20	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	9	13	4.00	1029/1416	4.52	4.45	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	2	4	3	9	3.75	820/1199	3.94	3.87	3.97	3.82	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	5	4	8	3.67	947/1312	4.04	4.33	4.00	3.69	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	5	3	10	3.90	992/1303	4.22	4.55	4.24	3.93	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	6	3	11	4.14	869/1299	4.44	4.59	4.25	3.94	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	8	16	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 758	3.75	4.07	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	4
				Required for Majors	15
				Graduate	0
				Major	4

28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	1

General	5
Electives	1
Other	7

Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
------------	----	-----------	----

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1209
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	10	8	14	3.91	1183/1504	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.13	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	18	9	3.94	1102/1503	4.22	4.31	4.20	4.16	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	5	12	16	4.14	866/1290	4.38	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	9	14	9	3.85	1136/1453	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.11	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	6	8	14	3.85	903/1421	3.99	4.33	4.00	3.91	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	13	17	3	3.60	1104/1365	3.96	4.15	4.08	3.96	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	1	7	22	4.32	682/1485	4.48	4.41	4.16	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	6	15	13	4.21	1307/1504	4.63	4.55	4.69	4.66	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	10	17	5	3.79	1105/1483	4.28	4.32	4.06	3.97	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	8	20	4.41	888/1425	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.36	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	13	19	4.47	1148/1426	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	4	16	12	4.15	939/1418	4.36	4.41	4.25	4.20	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	5	8	19	4.44	714/1416	4.52	4.45	4.26	4.21	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	3	2	9	6	3	3.17	1025/1199	3.94	3.87	3.97	3.82	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	5	8	4	5	3.41	1051/1312	4.04	4.33	4.00	3.69	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	4	7	4	6	3.45	1130/1303	4.22	4.55	4.24	3.93	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	922/1299	4.44	4.59	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	16	4	0	0	1	1	2.17	****/ 758	3.75	4.07	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 100 0201
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1209
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	36	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0301
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1210
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	416/1504	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	14	4.43	602/1503	4.22	4.31	4.20	4.16	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	701/1290	4.38	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	440/1453	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	6	14	4.30	509/1421	3.99	4.33	4.00	3.91	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	245/1365	3.96	4.15	4.08	3.96	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	412/1485	4.48	4.41	4.16	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	329/1504	4.63	4.55	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	234/1483	4.28	4.32	4.06	3.97	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	618/1425	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.36	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1426	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55	526/1418	4.36	4.41	4.25	4.20	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	19	4.73	366/1416	4.52	4.45	4.26	4.21	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	386/1199	3.94	3.87	3.97	3.82	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	549/1312	4.04	4.33	4.00	3.69	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	529/1303	4.22	4.55	4.24	3.93	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	293/1299	4.44	4.59	4.25	3.94	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	664/ 758	3.75	4.07	4.01	3.80	3.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0401
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1211
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	0	0	12	21	4.64	386/1504	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	15	14	4.30	795/1503	4.22	4.31	4.20	4.16	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	23	4.61	412/1290	4.38	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1453	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	18	14	4.39	419/1421	3.99	4.33	4.00	3.91	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1365	3.96	4.15	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	290/1485	4.48	4.41	4.16	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	263/1504	4.63	4.55	4.69	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	219/1483	4.28	4.32	4.06	3.97	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	366/1425	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.36	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	351/1426	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	13	18	4.48	604/1418	4.36	4.41	4.25	4.20	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	175/1416	4.52	4.45	4.26	4.21	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	329/1199	3.94	3.87	3.97	3.82	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	512/1312	4.04	4.33	4.00	3.69	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	422/1303	4.22	4.55	4.24	3.93	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	203/1299	4.44	4.59	4.25	3.94	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	14	15	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 758	3.75	4.07	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	12	General	6	Under-grad	34	Non-major	29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 100 0501
 Title AMER GOVT & POLITICS
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1212
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	24	4.51	535/1504	4.30	4.44	4.27	4.13	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	20	4.33	751/1503	4.22	4.31	4.20	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	24	4.41	628/1290	4.38	4.44	4.28	4.19	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	618/1453	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	10	6	15	3.59	1067/1421	3.99	4.33	4.00	3.91	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	1	1	4	0	8	3.93	878/1365	3.96	4.15	4.08	3.96	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	3	8	24	4.43	550/1485	4.48	4.41	4.16	4.13	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	2	34	4.86	726/1504	4.63	4.55	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	274/1483	4.28	4.32	4.06	3.97	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	9	26	4.65	603/1425	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.36	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	0	34	4.84	667/1426	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	5	27	4.57	501/1418	4.36	4.41	4.25	4.20	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	3	30	4.54	583/1416	4.52	4.45	4.26	4.21	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	33	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1199	3.94	3.87	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	1	5	21	4.48	384/1312	4.04	4.33	4.00	3.69	4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	6	20	4.50	563/1303	4.22	4.55	4.24	3.93	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	6	3	19	4.34	732/1299	4.44	4.59	4.25	3.94	4.34
4. Were special techniques successful	10	17	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	273/ 758	3.75	4.07	4.01	3.80	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 1	B 16		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 11	C 2	General	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 10	D 0	Electives	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		
				Other	13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 200 0101
 Title INTRO TO POLITICS
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1213
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	7	9	11	3.87	1214/1504	3.87	4.44	4.27	4.26	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	7	15	5	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.31	4.20	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	1185/1290	3.36	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	4	12	8	3.86	1136/1453	3.86	4.30	4.21	4.20	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	6	11	6	3.48	1125/1421	3.48	4.33	4.00	3.90	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	7	12	3.90	903/1365	3.90	4.15	4.08	4.00	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	10	9	6	3.40	1312/1485	3.40	4.41	4.16	4.15	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	726/1504	4.87	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	7	12	5	3.84	1051/1483	3.84	4.32	4.06	4.02	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	4	11	11	3.97	1188/1425	3.97	4.57	4.41	4.40	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	755/1426	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	7	7	13	4.03	1003/1418	4.03	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	9	13	4.18	937/1416	4.18	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	3	4	5	6	2	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.87	3.97	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	632/1312	4.19	4.33	4.00	3.98	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	596/1303	4.48	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	494/1299	4.62	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	664/ 758	3.17	4.07	4.01	3.89	3.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	15
			? 2		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 210 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Furlow, Shanays
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1214
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	6	18	4.50	549/1504	4.38	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	15	9	4.11	990/1503	3.94	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	12	11	4.07	906/1290	4.02	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	9	13	4.18	867/1453	4.11	4.30	4.21	4.20	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	356/1421	4.45	4.33	4.00	3.90	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	6	8	9	3.88	915/1365	3.90	4.15	4.08	4.00	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	5	7	12	3.96	1028/1485	3.95	4.41	4.16	4.15	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	26	2	4.07	1392/1504	4.04	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	11	8	4.00	850/1483	3.87	4.32	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	8	14	4.26	1036/1425	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	549/1426	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	8	5	13	4.11	972/1418	3.90	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	8	14	4.19	929/1416	4.11	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	636/1199	4.06	3.87	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	502/1312	4.11	4.33	4.00	3.98	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	390/1303	4.51	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	243/1299	4.71	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	4	1	5	2	4	3.06	675/ 758	3.15	4.07	4.01	3.89	3.06

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Furlow, Shanays
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1215
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	2	11	18	4.26	876/1504	4.38	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	8	15	8	3.76	1202/1503	3.94	4.31	4.20	4.18	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	1	1	17	11	3.97	971/1290	4.02	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	3	3	15	10	4.03	984/1453	4.11	4.30	4.21	4.20	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	10	21	4.44	374/1421	4.45	4.33	4.00	3.90	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	0	4	16	10	3.91	903/1365	3.90	4.15	4.08	4.00	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	6	9	14	3.94	1057/1485	3.95	4.41	4.16	4.15	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	29	3	4.00	1411/1504	4.04	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	6	15	4	3.74	1129/1483	3.87	4.32	4.06	4.02	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	6	6	19	4.24	1043/1425	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	4	26	4.64	1008/1426	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	4	8	10	9	3.69	1193/1418	3.90	4.41	4.25	4.22	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	5	8	16	4.03	1018/1416	4.11	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	21	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	593/1199	4.06	3.87	3.97	3.95	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	6	2	14	3.85	845/1312	4.11	4.33	4.00	3.98	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	2	6	16	4.30	770/1303	4.51	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	537/1299	4.71	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	2	3	6	8	2	3.24	652/ 758	3.15	4.07	4.01	3.89	3.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 210 0201
 Title POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 Instructor: Furlow, Shanays
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1215
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 230 0101
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1216
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	10	19	4.44	654/1504	4.59	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	22	4.59	391/1503	4.57	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	20	4.50	507/1290	4.48	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	7	8	13	4.14	912/1453	4.21	4.30	4.21	4.20	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	25	4.69	200/1421	4.65	4.33	4.00	3.90	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	1	2	12	12	3.97	830/1365	4.13	4.15	4.08	4.00	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	5	25	4.66	300/1485	4.74	4.41	4.16	4.15	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	24	4	4.00	1411/1504	3.98	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	530/1483	4.47	4.32	4.06	4.02	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	285/1425	4.82	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	572/1426	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	11	18	4.52	565/1418	4.60	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	23	4.58	544/1416	4.64	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	6	12	7	3.79	805/1199	3.87	3.87	3.97	3.95	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	5	11	4.10	691/1312	4.24	4.33	4.00	3.98	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	652/1303	4.63	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	523/1299	4.62	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	15	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 230 0201
 Title INTRO CONSTITUTIONAL L
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1217
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	23	4.75	262/1504	4.59	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	437/1503	4.57	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	9	17	4.46	561/1290	4.48	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	12	10	4.28	741/1453	4.21	4.30	4.21	4.20	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	247/1421	4.65	4.33	4.00	3.90	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	547/1365	4.13	4.15	4.08	4.00	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	139/1485	4.74	4.41	4.16	4.15	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	25	1	3.96	1428/1504	3.98	4.55	4.69	4.68	3.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	266/1483	4.47	4.32	4.06	4.02	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	331/1425	4.82	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	643/1426	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	342/1418	4.60	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	407/1416	4.64	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	3	3	5	11	3.96	692/1199	3.87	3.87	3.97	3.95	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	483/1312	4.24	4.33	4.00	3.98	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	268/1303	4.63	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	445/1299	4.62	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	12

84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	18
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: POLI 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO PUBLIC ADMIN
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1218
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	3	5	18	4.24	902/1504	4.24	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	16	4.24	859/1503	4.24	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	17	4.41	628/1290	4.41	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	7	14	4.03	984/1453	4.03	4.30	4.21	4.20	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	3	4	17	4.21	579/1421	4.21	4.33	4.00	3.90	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	6	5	11	3.66	1072/1365	3.66	4.15	4.08	4.00	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	329/1485	4.62	4.41	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	2	12	7	4.09	798/1483	4.09	4.32	4.06	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	3	20	4.52	772/1425	4.52	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	401/1426	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	6	20	4.63	426/1418	4.63	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	1	1	21	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	4	7	13	4.07	610/1199	4.07	3.87	3.97	3.95	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	1	5	8	3.83	858/1312	3.83	4.33	4.00	3.98	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	815/1303	4.22	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	909/1299	4.06	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.07	4.01	3.89	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1219
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	1	5	13	16	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	17	4.28	827/1503	4.28	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	7	20	4.22	809/1290	4.22	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	0	7	4	13	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.30	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	11	22	4.47	347/1421	4.47	4.33	4.00	3.90	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	5	2	3	3	12	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	4.15	4.08	4.00	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	12	21	4.47	495/1485	4.47	4.41	4.16	4.15	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	26	7	4.11	1376/1504	4.11	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	14	14	4.32	555/1483	4.32	4.32	4.06	4.02	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	29	4.77	384/1425	4.77	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6	28	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.41	4.25	4.22	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	26	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	7	4	20	4.31	446/1199	4.31	3.87	3.97	3.95	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	4	7	14	4.19	638/1312	4.19	4.33	4.00	3.98	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	535/1303	4.56	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	293/1299	4.81	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	5	2	2	5	8	3.41	614/ 758	3.41	4.07	4.01	3.89	3.41
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: POLI 260 0101
 Title COMPARATIVE POLITICS
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1219
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	2						
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	27				
				?	4						

Course-Section: POLI 280 0101
 Title INTERNATIONAL RELATION
 Instructor: HODY, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1220
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	10	22	4.28	864/1504	4.28	4.44	4.27	4.26	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	13	14	3.95	1094/1503	3.95	4.31	4.20	4.18	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	15	21	4.40	642/1290	4.40	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	11	23	4.45	532/1453	4.45	4.30	4.21	4.20	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	27	4.63	235/1421	4.63	4.33	4.00	3.90	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	18	16	4.26	569/1365	4.26	4.15	4.08	4.00	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	12	22	4.38	625/1485	4.38	4.41	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	38	2	4.05	1397/1504	4.05	4.55	4.69	4.68	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	7	18	11	4.11	782/1483	4.11	4.32	4.06	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	6	12	16	4.05	1147/1425	4.05	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	36	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	13	11	12	3.84	1123/1418	3.84	4.41	4.25	4.22	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	6	8	14	3.61	1216/1416	3.61	4.45	4.26	4.24	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	30	3	2	1	0	1	2.14	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	5	4	8	11	3.79	882/1312	3.79	4.33	4.00	3.98	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	585/1303	4.48	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	4	23	4.69	425/1299	4.69	4.59	4.25	4.21	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	11	22	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	3.89	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		Major 24

56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	7	Under-grad	40	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 310 0101
 Title POLITICAL PHIL. TO 160
 Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1221
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1504	4.91	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	346/1503	4.64	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.44	4.28	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	396/1453	4.55	4.30	4.21	4.23	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	90/1421	4.91	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	205/1365	4.64	4.15	4.08	4.08	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.41	4.16	4.17	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1483	4.78	4.32	4.06	4.08	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	179/1425	4.91	4.57	4.41	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1418	4.91	4.41	4.25	4.26	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	243/1416	4.82	4.45	4.26	4.27	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	884/1199	3.60	3.87	3.97	4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	234/1312	4.70	4.33	4.00	4.09	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	678/1299	4.40	4.59	4.25	4.30	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.07	4.01	4.00	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 324 0101
 Title THE CONGRESS
 Instructor: KING-MEADOWS, T
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1222
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	763/1504	4.35	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1202/1503	3.76	4.31	4.20	4.22	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1116/1290	3.65	4.44	4.28	4.31	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	9	3	3.59	1258/1453	3.59	4.30	4.21	4.23	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	516/1421	4.29	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	7	3	3.53	1138/1365	3.53	4.15	4.08	4.08	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	9	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.41	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.32	4.06	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	760/1425	4.53	4.57	4.41	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	913/1426	4.71	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	7	3	3.59	1230/1418	3.59	4.41	4.25	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	2	9	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.45	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1110/1199	2.80	3.87	3.97	4.02	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	922/1312	3.71	4.33	4.00	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	780/1299	4.29	4.59	4.25	4.30	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 350 0101
 Title POLICY-MAKING PROCESS
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1223
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	5	7	12	4.16	991/1504	4.16	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	11	4.04	1027/1503	4.04	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	4	13	4.04	919/1290	4.04	4.44	4.28	4.31	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	6	10	3.88	1123/1453	3.88	4.30	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	11	9	4.04	718/1421	4.04	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	9	7	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.15	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	7	11	4.13	914/1485	4.13	4.41	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	854/1504	4.78	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	4.32	4.06	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	688/1425	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	1096/1426	4.54	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	8	8	7	3.96	1055/1418	3.96	4.41	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	945/1416	4.17	4.45	4.26	4.27	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1039/1199	3.11	3.87	3.97	4.02	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	697/1312	4.07	4.33	4.00	4.09	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	893/1303	4.07	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	869/1299	4.14	4.59	4.25	4.30	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	751/ 758	2.14	4.07	4.01	4.00	2.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
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	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 352 0101
 Title ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1224
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	3	19	4.74	284/1504	4.74	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	380/1503	4.61	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	270/1290	4.74	4.44	4.28	4.31	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.30	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	8	14	4.52	305/1421	4.52	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	737/1365	4.08	4.15	4.08	4.08	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	22	4.87	118/1485	4.87	4.41	4.16	4.17	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	8	4.35	1214/1504	4.35	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	1	0	0	7	10	4.39	481/1483	4.39	4.32	4.06	4.08	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	239/1425	4.86	4.57	4.41	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	21	4.86	596/1426	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	191/1418	4.81	4.41	4.25	4.26	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	296/1416	4.77	4.45	4.26	4.27	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	465/1312	4.40	4.33	4.00	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	237/1303	4.87	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	613/1299	4.47	4.59	4.25	4.30	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 23	Non-major 10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course-Section: POLI 388 0101
 Title INTERNATL CONFL & COOP
 Instructor: MILLER, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1225
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	2	4	5	3.79	1253/1504	3.79	4.44	4.27	4.27	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1119/1503	3.93	4.31	4.20	4.22	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	906/1290	4.08	4.44	4.28	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	5	6	3.93	1083/1453	3.93	4.30	4.21	4.23	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	986/1421	3.71	4.33	4.00	4.01	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	4	3	3.43	1191/1365	3.43	4.15	4.08	4.08	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	1116/1485	3.86	4.41	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1254/1483	3.45	4.32	4.06	4.08	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.57	4.41	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	1222/1426	4.36	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1181/1418	3.71	4.41	4.25	4.26	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1085/1416	3.93	4.45	4.26	4.27	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	894/1199	3.57	3.87	3.97	4.02	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	5	1	1	3.11	1128/1312	3.11	4.33	4.00	4.09	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1000/1303	3.89	4.55	4.24	4.27	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.59	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 395 0101
 Title U.S. NAT'L SECURITY PO
 Instructor: THOMPSON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1226
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	5	22	4.63	386/1504	4.63	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	290/1503	4.69	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	240/1290	4.77	4.44	4.28	4.31	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	1	1	8	15	4.35	668/1453	4.35	4.30	4.21	4.23	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	218/1421	4.66	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	3	1	6	11	4.05	759/1365	4.05	4.15	4.08	4.08	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	24	4.70	260/1485	4.70	4.41	4.16	4.17	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	1081/1504	4.52	4.55	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	314/1483	4.54	4.32	4.06	4.08	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	179/1425	4.90	4.57	4.41	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	247/1418	4.77	4.41	4.25	4.26	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	187/1416	4.87	4.45	4.26	4.27	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	171/1199	4.68	3.87	3.97	4.02	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	497/1303	4.61	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	385/1299	4.72	4.59	4.25	4.30	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	4.07	4.01	4.00	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: POLI 395 0101
 Title U.S. NAT'L SECURITY PO
 Instructor: THOMPSON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1226
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	25	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	32	Non-major	13
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 400 0101
 Title QUAL RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1227
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	1	3	9	9	14	3.89	1204/1504	3.92	4.44	4.27	4.33	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	9	19	4.29	816/1503	4.23	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	27	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	606/1453	4.29	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	7	7	13	3.63	1043/1421	3.40	4.33	4.00	4.02	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	1	5	2	10	4.17	672/1365	4.25	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	10	17	4.17	854/1485	4.15	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	24	7	4.15	1345/1504	4.10	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	657/1483	4.31	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	10	21	4.40	900/1425	4.54	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	11	22	4.54	1096/1426	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	6	21	4.29	808/1418	4.51	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	7	22	4.41	740/1416	4.58	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	1	1	4	0	6	3.75	820/1199	3.71	3.87	3.97	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	1	22	4.46	404/1312	4.57	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	26	4.83	278/1303	4.78	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	385/1299	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	7	18	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	214/ 758	4.45	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 400 0101
 Title QUAL RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1227
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	24	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	30
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	6
84-150	25	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	3						

Course-Section: POLI 400 0201
 Title QUAL RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1228
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	5	9	8	3.96	1143/1504	3.92	4.44	4.27	4.33	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	6	11	4.17	937/1503	4.23	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	844/1453	4.29	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	7	7	4	3.17	1269/1421	3.40	4.33	4.00	4.02	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	493/1365	4.25	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	4	12	4.13	914/1485	4.15	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	19	4	4.04	1400/1504	4.10	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	481/1483	4.31	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	541/1425	4.54	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	1050/1426	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	303/1418	4.51	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	352/1416	4.58	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	860/1199	3.71	3.87	3.97	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	241/1312	4.57	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	378/1303	4.78	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	537/1299	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/ 758	4.45	4.07	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	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	22				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 409B 0101
 Title POLITICS OF TERRORISM
 Instructor: CROATTI, MARK
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1229
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	1	5	38	4.84	176/1504	4.84	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	13	23	4.30	805/1503	4.30	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	13	21	4.14	873/1290	4.14	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	14	26	4.45	517/1453	4.45	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	14	26	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	2	14	22	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	32	4.61	339/1485	4.61	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	2	17	17	4.35	518/1483	4.35	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	34	4.72	474/1425	4.72	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	42	4.95	251/1426	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	11	30	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	37	4.79	268/1416	4.79	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	2	5	15	15	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	6	9	22	4.37	502/1312	4.37	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	6	3	28	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	7	7	23	4.34	732/1299	4.34	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.34
4. Were special techniques successful	6	23	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	359/ 758	4.13	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.13
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	44	Non-major	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	13	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						

I 0
? 1

Other

28

Course-Section: POLI 419B 0101
 Title :
 Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1230
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1504	4.92	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.44	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	88/1485	4.92	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.32	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.41	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.45	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	111/1312	4.91	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.91	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 419B 0101
 Title .
 Instructor: VAUGHAN, GEOFFR
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1230
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 428 0101
 Title POLITICS INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1231
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.30	4.21	4.22	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.41	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1257/1425	3.75	4.57	4.41	4.38	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1167/1416	3.75	4.45	4.26	4.26	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.55	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.07	4.01	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 429 0101
 Title SEL TOP AMERICAN GOVT
 Instructor: FUNKE, ODELIA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1232
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	2	3	6	0	5	3.19	1429/1504	3.19	4.44	4.27	4.33	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	1	5	3.06	1411/1503	3.06	4.31	4.20	4.18	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	5	3	5	3.44	1317/1453	3.44	4.30	4.21	4.22	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	4	7	3.69	1004/1421	3.69	4.33	4.00	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	5	3	3.19	1266/1365	3.19	4.15	4.08	4.09	3.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	4	7	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.41	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.94	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	5	6	1	3.29	1319/1483	3.29	4.32	4.06	4.11	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	4	3	5	3.64	1282/1425	3.64	4.57	4.41	4.38	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1232/1418	3.57	4.41	4.25	4.25	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	4	5	3.57	1225/1416	3.57	4.45	4.26	4.26	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	2	9	3.88	832/1312	3.88	4.33	4.00	4.07	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	529/1303	4.56	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	705/1299	4.38	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	0	13	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	71/ 76	3.00	3.00	4.61	4.63	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	63/ 70	3.00	3.00	4.35	4.63	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	60/ 67	3.00	3.00	4.34	4.34	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	74/ 76	2.50	2.50	4.44	4.51	2.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	66/ 73	3.00	3.00	4.17	4.29	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 432 0101
 Title CIVIL RIGHTS
 Instructor: SULLIVAN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1233
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	228/1504	4.78	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	9	21	4.56	426/1503	4.56	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	10	21	4.63	389/1290	4.63	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	260/1453	4.68	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	112/1421	4.84	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	9	2	20	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	161/1483	4.73	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	194/1425	4.90	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	525/1426	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	178/1418	4.83	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	187/1416	4.86	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	3	0	0	2	6	3.73	835/1199	3.73	3.87	3.97	4.05	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	67/1312	4.95	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	207/1303	4.89	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	160/ 758	4.59	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.59

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	15
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 435 0101
 Title LEGAL REASONING
 Instructor: BARNER-BARRY, C
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1234
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	376/1504	4.64	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	478/1290	4.54	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	618/1453	4.38	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	170/1485	4.79	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	999/1504	4.64	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	119/1483	4.80	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1245/1425	3.80	4.57	4.41	4.38	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1225/1418	3.60	4.41	4.25	4.25	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1304/1416	3.20	4.45	4.26	4.26	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.55	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
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	8				
				?	2						

Course-Section: POLI 436 0101
 Title HEALTH LAW
 Instructor: MILLER, JENNIFE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1235
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	310/1453	4.63	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1421	4.88	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	211/1365	4.63	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	625/1485	4.38	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.32	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	682/1418	4.43	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	201/1199	4.63	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.71	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	557/ 758	3.60	4.07	4.01	4.17	3.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101
 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1236
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1503	4.89	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	97/1421	4.89	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	211/1365	4.63	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1485	4.89	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	173/1483	4.71	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.41	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	201/1199	4.63	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	221/1312	4.71	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.55	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	328/ 758	4.20	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 438 0101
 Title LEGAL INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1236
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 438H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: DAVIS, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1237
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: POLI 458 0101
 Title ADMIN INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: JOHNSON, ARTHUR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1238
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	455/1504	4.57	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	108/1421	4.86	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	395/1365	4.43	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	124/1485	4.86	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	433/1483	4.57	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	317/1418	4.86	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.93	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.87	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.83	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 56	4.80	4.80	4.23	4.37	4.80
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	35/ 44	4.33	4.33	4.65	4.33	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	38/ 47	3.80	3.80	4.29	4.12	3.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	0			

Course-Section: POLI 458 0101
 Title ADMIN INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1239
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	455/1504	4.57	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	108/1421	4.86	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	395/1365	4.43	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	124/1485	4.86	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	173/1483	4.57	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1418	4.86	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	4.93	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.87	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.83	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 56	4.80	4.80	4.23	4.37	4.80
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	35/ 44	4.33	4.33	4.65	4.33	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	38/ 47	3.80	3.80	4.29	4.12	3.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	0			

Course-Section: POLI 469A 0101
 Title COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIV
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1240
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	14	4.81	198/1504	4.81	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	194/1290	4.81	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	222/1453	4.71	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	499/1421	4.31	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	472/1365	4.36	4.15	4.08	4.09	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	391/1485	4.56	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1193/1504	4.38	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	115/1483	4.81	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	366/1425	4.79	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	198/1416	4.86	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	901/1199	3.56	3.87	3.97	4.05	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.90	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	62/ 758	4.90	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 469B 0101
 Title INSTITUTIONAL DEV.
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1241
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1504	4.92	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	95/1503	4.92	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.30	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	81/1421	4.92	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.15	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	370/1485	4.58	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1483	4.88	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	587/1199	4.13	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.55	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.59	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: POLI 469B 0101
 Title INSTITUTIONAL DEV.
 Instructor: FORESTIERE, CAR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1241
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 485 0101
 Title DYN OF THE ARAB-ISRAEL
 Instructor: FREEDMAN, ROBER
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1242
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	318/1504	4.71	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	541/1503	4.47	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	846/1290	4.18	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	810/1453	4.22	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	401/1421	4.41	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	922/1365	3.88	4.15	4.08	4.09	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	391/1485	4.56	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	804/1483	4.08	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	760/1425	4.53	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	922/1418	4.18	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	394/1416	4.71	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	414/1312	4.45	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.91	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	203/1299	4.91	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	243/ 758	4.40	4.07	4.01	4.17	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	3.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	3.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	2.50	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.80	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.80	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

Course-Section: POLI 485 0101
 Title DYN OF THE ARAB-ISRAEL
 Instructor: FREEDMAN, ROBER
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1242
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: POLI 489A 0101
 Title SOUTH ASIA
 Instructor: HAGERTY, DEVIN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1243
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	13	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	426/1503	4.56	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	194/1290	4.81	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	439/1421	4.38	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.15	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	2	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	187/1483	4.69	4.32	4.06	4.11	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	88/1418	4.93	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	692/1303	4.38	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	696/1299	4.38	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: POLI 489B 0101
 Title HUMAN RIGHTS
 Instructor: MELCAVAGE, EUGE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1244
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	1052/1504	4.09	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	1178/1503	3.82	4.31	4.20	4.18	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	758/1290	4.29	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.30	4.21	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	499/1421	4.32	4.33	4.00	4.02	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	7	6	3.95	854/1365	3.95	4.15	4.08	4.09	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	902/1485	4.14	4.41	4.16	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	8	4	3.82	1072/1483	3.82	4.32	4.06	4.11	3.82

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	724/1425	4.55	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	939/1418	4.15	4.41	4.25	4.25	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	2	11	4.15	953/1416	4.15	4.45	4.26	4.26	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	794/1312	3.93	4.33	4.00	4.07	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	780/1299	4.29	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.07	4.01	4.17	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	22	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: poli 499
 Title american foreign policy 1989 - 2004
 Instructor:
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 3
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	11	20	4.65	376/1504	****	4.90	4.27	4.13	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	23	4.58	403/1503	****	4.91	4.20	4.16	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	400/1290	****	4.92	4.28	4.19	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	578/1453	****	4.87	4.21	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	7	6	15	4.13	651/1421	****	4.79	4.00	3.91	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	282/1365	****	4.75	4.08	3.96	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	21	4.50	455/1485	****	4.74	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	903/1504	****	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	11	12	4.27	624/1483	****	4.33	4.06	3.97	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	587/1425	****	4.93	4.41	4.36	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1426	****	4.99	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	3	21	4.55	514/1418	****	4.91	4.25	4.20	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	268/1416	****	4.95	4.26	4.21	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	455/1199	****	4.88	3.97	3.82	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	8	2	10	4.00	716/1312	****	4.78	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	3	15	4.48	596/1303	****	4.90	4.24	3.93	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	494/1299	****	4.91	4.25	3.94	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	11	16	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 758	****	4.98	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	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	22				
				?							