

Course-Section: PUBL 600 1
 Title Research Methodology
 Instructor: Kirk,Adele M.
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1321
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	842/1509	4.29	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	753/1509	4.35	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	381/1287	4.65	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	792/1459	4.24	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	486/1406	4.35	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	434/1489	4.53	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.82	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	700/1438	4.59	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	789/1411	4.35	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	486/1405	4.65	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	0	4	4	1	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	7	7	4.13	701/1260	4.13	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	535/1258	4.63	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	422/ 873	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.08
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.33	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.33	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	7	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PUBL 601 1
 Title Political/Social Conte
 Instructor: Shetterley,Davi
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1322
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	745/1509	4.38	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	519/1509	4.52	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	614/1287	4.43	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	638/1459	4.38	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	570/1384	4.30	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	151/1489	4.80	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	917/1506	4.70	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	714/1463	4.18	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	712/1438	4.57	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	8	11	4.29	874/1405	4.29	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	3	9	5	3.70	883/1236	3.70	3.84	4.00	3.98	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	5	12	4.20	666/1260	4.20	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	12	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PUBL 603 1
 Title Policy Analysis
 Instructor: Miller, Nancy
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1323
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1065/1509	4.07	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	828/1509	4.29	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.52	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	715/1459	4.31	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	971/1406	3.86	4.21	4.09	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	421/1384	4.43	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	376/1489	4.57	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	957/1506	4.64	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1052/1463	3.82	4.17	4.09	4.15	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	1047/1438	4.29	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	1015/1411	4.07	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	7	5	3.93	1115/1405	3.93	4.23	4.32	4.33	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1026/1236	3.42	3.84	4.00	3.98	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1086/1260	3.42	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	563/1258	4.58	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	771/ 873	3.25	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 604 1
 Title Statistical Analysis
 Instructor: Marcotte,Dave E
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1324
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	127/1287	4.90	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.21	4.09	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.24	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1030/1506	4.56	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	376/1411	4.70	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	706/1260	4.11	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1255	4.78	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.88	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.95	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	73/ 184	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	83/ 198	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	Major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major 3
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PUBL 607 1
 Title Stat Appl In Eval Resr
 Instructor: Mandell,Marvin
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1325
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	421/1384	4.43	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	376/1489	4.57	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1146/1506	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	438/1463	4.43	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	291/1438	4.86	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1411	4.57	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	874/1405	4.29	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	421/1236	4.33	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1102/1260	3.33	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1127/1255	3.50	4.49	4.33	4.43	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.95	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 608 1
 Title Appl Multivariate Regr
 Instructor: Salkever,David
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1326
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.15	4.26	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	971/1406	3.86	4.21	4.09	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	718/1384	4.14	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1275/1489	3.57	4.24	4.17	4.14	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1354/1463	3.20	4.17	4.09	4.15	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1135/1438	4.17	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1218/1411	3.71	4.26	4.31	4.33	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	802/1258	4.29	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610 2
 Title Special Topics In Publ
 Instructor: Kirk,Adele M.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1327
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1509	4.39	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	979/1459	4.28	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	807/1384	4.39	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.40	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	828/1405	4.00	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260	4.78	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.78	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.78	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.50	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 89	4.50	4.60	4.49	4.39	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.93	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.87	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	4.71	4.74	4.38	4.30	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 610 3
 Title Special Topics In Publ
 Instructor: Marcotte,Dave E
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1328
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1002/1509	4.39	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1287	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	400/1459	4.28	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	132/1384	4.39	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	896/1489	4.40	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1220/1405	4.00	4.23	4.32	4.33	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.78	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.78	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.78	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.50	3.95	4.03	4.01	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 89	4.50	4.60	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.93	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.87	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	55/ 92	4.71	4.74	4.38	4.30	4.43
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	64/ 93	4.43	4.29	4.06	4.04	3.86

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 613 1
 Title Managing Public Org
 Instructor: Fletcher, Patric
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1329
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1214/1509	3.90	4.40	4.31	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1331/1509	3.60	4.15	4.26	4.25	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.52	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1314/1459	3.50	4.14	4.22	4.16	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	739/1406	4.10	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1145/1384	3.60	4.39	4.11	4.16	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	0	2	1	2.67	1450/1489	2.67	4.24	4.17	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	4.17	4.09	4.15	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1132/1405	3.90	4.23	4.32	4.33	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.84	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	469/1260	4.44	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	584/1258	4.56	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 623 1
 Title Governmental Budgeting
 Instructor: Meyers,Roy T
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1330
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	386/1509	4.68	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1287	****	4.52	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	911/1459	4.11	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	423/1406	4.42	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	492/1384	4.37	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	1058/1489	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1188/1506	4.37	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	381/1463	4.47	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	559/1438	4.68	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	992/1411	4.11	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	568/1405	4.58	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	598/1236	4.13	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	528/1260	4.38	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	638/1255	4.44	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	350/1258	4.81	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 13 Major 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 6 Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PUBL 645 1
 Title The US City
 Instructor: Short,John
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1331
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	930/1438	4.40	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 89	4.80	4.60	4.49	4.39	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	36/ 92	4.80	4.93	4.54	4.52	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	50/ 90	4.60	4.87	4.50	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 92	4.80	4.74	4.38	4.30	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	53/ 93	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 652 1
 Title Politics of Health
 Instructor: Miller, Nancy
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1332
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	661/1509	4.45	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	657/1459	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	665/1406	4.18	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	174/1384	4.73	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	527/1489	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1038/1506	4.55	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	410/1463	4.44	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	933/1421	4.73	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1411	4.73	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	666/1260	4.20	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	665/1255	4.40	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	550/ 873	3.88	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.87	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.74	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.29	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 698 1
 Title Capstone
 Instructor: Norris, Donald F
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1333
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	374/1509	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1013/1509	3.84	4.15	4.26	4.25	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	715/1459	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.16	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	440/1384	4.42	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1120/1489	3.89	4.24	4.17	4.14	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1222/1506	4.48	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	774/1463	3.99	4.17	4.09	4.15	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	800/1438	4.33	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	936/1411	4.21	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	940/1405	3.82	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1236	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	469/1260	4.48	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	540/1255	4.63	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1258	3.93	4.54	4.38	4.50	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	209/ 873	3.94	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: PUBL 698 2
 Title Capstone
 Instructor: Short,John (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1334
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1509	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1283/1509	3.84	4.15	4.26	4.25	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.52	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1314/1459	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.16	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	4.00	4.21	4.09	4.12	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	421/1384	4.42	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	3.89	4.24	4.17	4.14	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1014/1506	4.48	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1021/1463	3.99	4.17	4.09	4.15	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1203/1438	4.33	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1204/1411	4.21	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1321/1405	3.82	4.23	4.32	4.33	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	415/1260	4.48	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.63	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1143/1258	3.93	4.54	4.38	4.50	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.94	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.87	4.50	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.74	4.38	4.30	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.29	4.06	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PUBL 698 2
 Title Capstone
 Instructor: Hanlon, Bernadet (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1335
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1509	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1283/1509	3.84	4.15	4.26	4.25	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.52	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1314/1459	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.16	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	4.00	4.21	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	421/1384	4.42	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	3.89	4.24	4.17	4.14	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1014/1506	4.48	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	853/1463	3.99	4.17	4.09	4.15	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.33	4.44	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.92	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	416/1411	4.21	4.26	4.31	4.33	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1047/1405	3.82	4.23	4.32	4.33	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	415/1260	4.48	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.63	4.49	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1143/1258	3.93	4.54	4.38	4.50	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.94	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.60	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.87	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.74	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.29	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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