

Course-Section: PUBL 600 0101
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1442
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	572/1639	4.55	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	3	10	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.10	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	822/1583	4.23	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	5	11	3.86	942/1532	3.86	4.28	4.01	4.10	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	3	2	13	4.09	982/1612	4.09	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	979/1635	4.68	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	473/1579	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.17	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	8	3	10	4.10	1206/1518	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.49	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	776/1520	4.82	4.92	4.70	4.79	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1059/1517	4.05	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	10	3.91	1161/1550	3.91	4.25	4.22	4.23	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	832/1295	3.76	3.73	3.94	3.95	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	6	4	8	3.95	840/1398	3.95	4.35	4.07	4.22	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	3	1	12	4.11	936/1391	4.11	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	674/1388	4.47	4.69	4.28	4.49	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	540/ 958	3.89	3.78	3.93	4.01	3.89	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	19	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	19	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PUBL 601 0101
 Title POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE
 Instructor: MILLER, CHERYL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1443
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	550/1639	4.56	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.10	4.22	4.26	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	795/1397	4.25	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	726/1583	4.31	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	299/1532	4.56	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	134/1612	4.87	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	548/1579	4.36	4.17	4.08	4.17	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.38	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	648/1517	4.47	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1213/1295	2.80	3.73	3.94	3.95	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.35	4.07	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.69	4.28	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	610/ 958	3.75	3.78	3.93	4.01	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	3.50	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 11
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	15

Course-Section: PUBL 610B 0101
 Title HEALTH POLICIES/PROGRA
 Instructor: SALKEVER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1445
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	4	4.44	698/1639	4.44	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.10	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	822/1397	4.22	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	758/1504	4.11	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	848/1612	4.22	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.17	4.08	4.17	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.38	4.43	4.49	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	674/1517	4.44	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	716/1550	4.44	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.73	3.94	3.95	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	651/1398	4.22	4.35	4.07	4.22	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	839/1391	4.22	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	3.78	3.93	4.01	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610C 0101
 Title CAUSAL INFER PROGRM EV
 Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1446
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	7	4.64	469/1639	4.64	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	382/1639	4.64	4.10	4.22	4.26	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1397	4.73	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	270/1583	4.73	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	478/1532	4.36	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	561/1612	4.45	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1579	4.45	4.17	4.08	4.17	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	345/1518	4.82	4.38	4.43	4.49	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.92	4.70	4.79	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	489/1550	4.64	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	753/1295	3.88	3.73	3.94	3.95	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	651/1398	4.22	4.35	4.07	4.22	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	368/1391	4.78	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.69	4.28	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.78	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 647 0101
 Title URBAN PROB & POLICY
 Instructor: NORRIS, DONALD
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1447
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	2	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.10	4.22	4.26	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.57	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.25	4.19	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.33	4.05	4.29	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1399/1612	3.50	4.28	4.16	4.27	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1420/1579	3.25	4.17	4.08	4.17	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1449/1518	3.33	4.38	4.43	4.49	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.92	4.70	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.00	4.15	4.27	4.32	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1385/1550	3.33	4.25	4.22	4.23	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	****	3.73	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.35	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.54	4.30	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.69	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	3.78	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.74	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	71/ 78	3.50	3.50	4.47	4.52	3.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.50	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	71/ 82	3.00	3.00	4.16	4.37	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	2	Under-grad
			Electives	3	Major
			Other	1	Non-major
					2
					3
					4
					5
					6
					7
					8
					9
					10
					11
					12
					13
					14
					15
					16
					17
					18
					19
					20
					21
					22
					23
					24
					25
					26
					27
					28
					29
					30
					31
					32
					33
					34
					35
					36
					37
					38
					39
					40
					41
					42
					43
					44
					45
					46
					47
					48
					49
					50

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0101
 Title Policy Analysis Capstone
 Instructor: Miller, N.
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 19
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	6	4.60	508/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	299/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	222/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	490/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	242/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	535/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	832/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	240/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0102
 Title Policy Analysis Capstone
 Instructor: Short, J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 20
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	2	4.20	951/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1522/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1465/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	667/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1518/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	1.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1512/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1501/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	511/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1157/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0102
 Title Policy Analysis Capstone
 Instructor: Short, J. (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 21
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	2	4.20	951/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1522/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1465/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	667/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	1.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	511/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1157/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	****

Frequency Distribution

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