

Course-Section: PUBL 600 0101
 Title RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1450
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	683/1649	4.48	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.09	4.27	4.44	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	538/1595	4.48	4.25	4.20	4.35	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	754/1533	4.10	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	493/1512	4.43	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	541/1623	4.48	3.98	4.16	4.29	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1004/1646	4.70	4.68	4.69	4.81	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	415/1621	4.47	4.32	4.06	4.20	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	840/1572	4.81	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	736/1559	4.48	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	440/1352	4.35	4.04	3.98	4.10	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	896/1384	3.89	4.19	4.08	4.30	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	676/1382	4.44	4.76	4.29	4.52	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.66	4.30	4.56	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	3	1	3	4	5	3.44	731/ 948	3.44	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.80	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.65	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.30	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.72	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.68	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	16	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PUBL 601 0101
 Title POLITICAL/SOCIAL CONTE
 Instructor: SHETTERLY, DAVI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1451
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	749/1649	4.42	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	370/1375	4.70	4.09	4.27	4.44	4.70		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	291/1595	4.70	4.25	4.20	4.35	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	162/1533	4.79	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	286/1512	4.63	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	296/1623	4.68	3.98	4.16	4.29	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	765/1646	4.84	4.68	4.69	4.81	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	12	3	4.13	835/1621	4.13	4.32	4.06	4.20	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	930/1568	4.45	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	600/1564	4.55	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	777/1559	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	4	3	3	3.38	1109/1352	3.38	4.04	3.98	4.10	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	582/1384	4.37	4.19	4.08	4.30	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	302/1382	4.84	4.76	4.29	4.52	4.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	449/1368	4.74	4.66	4.30	4.56	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	417/ 948	4.06	3.74	3.95	4.03	4.06	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.80	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.65	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.30	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.72	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.68	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PUBL 603 0101
 Title POLICY ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MILLER, NANCY A
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1452
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	776/1649	4.41	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	629/1648	4.45	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	4.09	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.25	4.20	4.35	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	16	4.57	427/1623	4.57	3.98	4.16	4.29	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	833/1646	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.81	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	13	3	4.06	886/1621	4.06	4.32	4.06	4.20	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	894/1572	4.77	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	822/1564	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	871/1559	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1016/1352	3.57	4.04	3.98	4.10	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	6	9	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.76	4.29	4.52	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	369/1368	4.81	4.66	4.30	4.56	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	682/ 948	3.58	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.58	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.80	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.65	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.30	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.72	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.68	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	5	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	16	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PUBL 607 0101
 Title STAT APPL IN EVAL RESR
 Instructor: MANDELL, MARVIN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1453
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	395/1649	4.70	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.09	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.35	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1415/1533	3.13	4.21	4.04	4.28	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	3	3.78	1107/1512	3.78	4.18	4.10	4.35	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	3.98	4.16	4.29	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1419/1646	4.22	4.68	4.69	4.81	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	331/1621	4.56	4.32	4.06	4.20	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1169/1568	4.20	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1083/1564	4.10	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1075/1559	4.10	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.04	3.98	4.10	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.19	4.08	4.30	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.76	4.29	4.52	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610A 0101
 Title HLTH COSTS/CNTRL PRACT
 Instructor: KIRK, ADELE
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1454
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1057/1649	4.17	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.25	4.20	4.35	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	703/1533	4.17	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1318/1623	3.67	3.98	4.16	4.29	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.68	4.69	4.81	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.32	4.06	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	832/1559	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.04	3.98	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	726/1384	4.17	4.19	4.08	4.30	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.83	4.76	4.29	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.66	4.30	4.56	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.74	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	50/ 88	4.60	4.80	4.54	4.63	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	28/ 85	4.80	4.65	4.47	4.50	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	37/ 81	4.60	4.30	4.43	4.43	4.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	35/ 92	4.60	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	219/ 288	3.20	3.68	3.68	3.87	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610B 0101
 Title NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND
 Instructor: MARCOTTE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1455
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.09	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.25	4.20	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1623	4.17	3.98	4.16	4.29	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.32	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1568	****	4.40	4.43	4.52	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	****	4.79	4.70	4.83	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1564	****	4.27	4.28	4.41	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1559	****	4.29	4.29	4.41	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.19	4.08	4.30	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.66	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.74	3.95	4.03	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.80	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	46/ 85	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.50	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	63/ 81	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.43	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/ 92	4.83	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	75/ 288	4.17	3.68	3.68	3.87	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610C 0101
 Title APPL REGRESSION ANALYS
 Instructor: SALKEVER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1456
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	4.21	4.23	4.34	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1328/1375	3.00	4.09	4.27	4.44	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1397/1595	3.50	4.25	4.20	4.35	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1068/1512	3.83	4.18	4.10	4.35	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	3.98	4.16	4.29	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.81	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	4.32	4.06	4.20	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1191/1568	4.17	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1256/1564	3.83	4.27	4.28	4.41	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	****	4.04	3.98	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.76	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	844/1368	4.25	4.66	4.30	4.56	4.25	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.65	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.30	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.72	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.68	3.68	3.87	****	

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 3	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 3	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PUBL 613 0101
 Title MANAGING PUBLIC ORG
 Instructor: FLETCHER, PATRI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1457
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	986/1649	4.23	4.45	4.28	4.46	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1388/1648	3.69	4.21	4.23	4.34	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.09	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	5	6	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.25	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	710/1533	4.15	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	627/1512	4.31	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1442/1623	3.38	3.98	4.16	4.29	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1092/1646	4.62	4.68	4.69	4.81	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	789/1621	4.17	4.32	4.06	4.20	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1080/1568	4.31	4.40	4.43	4.52	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	1037/1564	4.15	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	980/1559	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1352	****	4.04	3.98	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	726/1384	4.17	4.19	4.08	4.30	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.66	4.30	4.56	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	624/ 948	3.70	3.74	3.95	4.03	3.70	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.80	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.65	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.30	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.72	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.68	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0101
 Title Policy Analysis Capstone
 Instructor: Norris, Donald
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 7
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1498/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	4	0	2.70	1622/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	2.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1219/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	1.50	1529/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	1.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1298/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	0	1	4	0	2.40	1605/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	2.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	2	0	3.00	1504/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1539/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	2.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1463/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	2	1	0	2.25	1554/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	4	1	0	2.38	1535/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	2.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	4	0	1	0	0	1.40	1350/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	1.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	1	1	3.11	1244/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1251/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	2	3	0	1	2.33	1351/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	678/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	3.60
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	278/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	1.67
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	256/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	****

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 7	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0				
				I 0	Other 10			
				? 0				

Course-Section: PUBL 698 0101
 Title Policy Analysis Capstone
 Instructor: Kendrick, Jamie
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 15
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1391/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1574/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1067/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	2	1	1	0	1.64	1528/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	1.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	4	1	3	3.50	1266/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	5	0	3	3	0	2.36	1607/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	2.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1405/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	4	2	0	3.00	1515/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1487/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	1517/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	1348/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	1.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	1	1	3.00	1254/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1284/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1315/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	746/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	3.40
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	534/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	1.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	266/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	2.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

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