

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 114
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1353
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	2	5	11	21	32	4.07	1074/1522	3.92	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	27	25	4.03	1069/1522	3.97	4.21	4.26	4.18	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	6	24	36	4.27	759/1285	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.22	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	3	5	11	19	24	3.90	1127/1476	3.55	4.14	4.22	4.09	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	11	22	31	4.06	728/1412	3.99	4.18	4.06	4.01	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	5	7	16	18	18	3.58	1136/1381	3.59	4.09	4.08	3.93	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	14	16	39	4.30	740/1500	4.22	4.28	4.18	4.16	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	9	60	4.84	623/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	1	9	32	12	4.02	891/1497	3.93	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	7	15	47	4.58	716/1440	4.46	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	6	59	4.82	710/1448	4.71	4.78	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	11	21	37	4.38	751/1436	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.24	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	9	17	43	4.49	644/1432	4.18	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	3	2	14	47	4.54	259/1221	4.14	3.96	3.93	3.86	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	10	17	25	4.19	631/1280	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.92	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	3	7	13	31	4.33	743/1277	4.18	4.43	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	4	11	38	4.59	516/1269	4.42	4.51	4.31	4.04	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	23	6	3	7	5	10	3.32	729/ 854	3.53	3.82	4.02	3.87	3.32	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	68	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	1	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	1	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	2	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	2	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	68	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	68	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	68	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 114
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1353
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	11	Under-grad	73	Non-major	73
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1354
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	4	16	11	18	3.82	1259/1522	3.92	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	16	7	23	3.94	1146/1522	3.97	4.21	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	11	9	25	4.10	882/1285	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.22	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	1	4	7	7	8	3.63	1269/1476	3.55	4.14	4.22	4.09	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	7	14	24	4.23	594/1412	3.99	4.18	4.06	4.01	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	1	3	5	2	9	3.75	1046/1381	3.59	4.09	4.08	3.93	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	9	7	29	4.18	860/1500	4.22	4.28	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	6	1	6	34	4.45	1128/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	1	0	13	13	7	3.74	1160/1497	3.93	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	6	14	24	4.23	1063/1440	4.46	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	9	33	4.53	1131/1448	4.71	4.78	4.71	4.63	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	10	11	21	4.00	1056/1436	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	4	11	7	22	4.00	1036/1432	4.18	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	6	10	14	8	3.56	875/1221	4.14	3.96	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	6	7	13	4.07	694/1280	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.92	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	4	7	16	4.36	729/1277	4.18	4.43	4.34	4.13	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	509/1269	4.42	4.51	4.31	4.04	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	14	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	341/ 854	3.53	3.82	4.02	3.87	4.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1354
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	50	Non-major	50
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	3	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E
 Enrollment: 155
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1355
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	5	17	24	13	3.55	1387/1522	3.92	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	20	24	13	3.64	1309/1522	3.97	4.21	4.26	4.18	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	13	13	16	18	3.48	1168/1285	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.22	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	44	2	5	8	2	3	2.95	1424/1476	3.55	4.14	4.22	4.09	2.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	6	5	16	17	16	3.53	1149/1412	3.99	4.18	4.06	4.01	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	53	2	0	4	1	2	3.11	****/1381	3.59	4.09	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	4	6	18	30	4.11	924/1500	4.22	4.28	4.18	4.16	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	34	27	4.40	1161/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	2	4	13	21	12	3.71	1174/1497	3.93	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	5	21	35	4.36	969/1440	4.46	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	10	49	4.68	977/1448	4.71	4.78	4.71	4.63	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	13	24	22	3.98	1076/1436	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.24	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	13	18	26	3.95	1081/1432	4.18	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	3	13	20	24	3.94	668/1221	4.14	3.96	3.93	3.86	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	4	5	9	15	5	3.32	1113/1280	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.92	3.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	4	3	9	7	15	3.68	1088/1277	4.18	4.43	4.34	4.13	3.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	2	1	10	9	16	3.95	926/1269	4.42	4.51	4.31	4.04	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	30	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	****/ 854	3.53	3.82	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	18	0.00-0.99 1	A 24	Required for Majors	34
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 2	B 19		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 11	C 8	General	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 2		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 128
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1356
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	8	0	0	2	12	11	29	4.24	909/1522	3.92	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	9	19	25	4.26	874/1522	3.97	4.21	4.26	4.18	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	1	6	7	12	28	4.11	873/1285	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.22	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	4	1	7	14	9	18	3.73	1207/1476	3.55	4.14	4.22	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	2	1	4	11	6	29	4.14	671/1412	3.99	4.18	4.06	4.01	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	2	4	9	14	9	15	3.43	1184/1381	3.59	4.09	4.08	3.93	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	0	5	7	8	31	4.27	760/1500	4.22	4.28	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	1	0	1	0	18	31	4.58	1011/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	0	1	1	24	12	4.24	674/1497	3.93	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	3	9	38	4.65	630/1440	4.46	4.43	4.45	4.40	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	1	6	43	4.78	802/1448	4.71	4.78	4.71	4.63	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	4	13	34	4.59	502/1436	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.24	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	3	6	11	29	4.28	862/1432	4.18	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	1	1	4	8	34	4.52	265/1221	4.14	3.96	3.93	3.86	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	1	9	6	15	3.94	792/1280	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.92	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	2	5	6	20	4.33	743/1277	4.18	4.43	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	0	4	4	24	4.52	578/1269	4.42	4.51	4.31	4.04	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	10	3	5	7	2	5	3.05	775/ 854	3.53	3.82	4.02	3.87	3.05	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 128
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1356
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1357
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	9	22	4.66	443/1522	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	255/1522	4.57	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	204/1285	4.74	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	357/1476	4.51	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	402/1412	4.12	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	240/1381	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	24	4.66	325/1500	4.61	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	195/1517	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	296/1497	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	256/1440	4.45	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	602/1448	4.75	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	132/1436	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	254/1432	4.46	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	219/1221	4.51	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	267/1280	4.14	4.16	4.10	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	205/1277	4.69	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	266/1269	4.72	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	525/ 854	3.20	3.82	4.02	4.00	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 32	Non-major 27
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 23		
				? 1			

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1358
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	8	9	3.92	1200/1522	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	702/1522	4.57	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	386/1285	4.74	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	17	4.40	629/1476	4.51	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	5	4	12	3.80	973/1412	4.12	4.18	4.06	4.03	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	5	2	10	3.71	1070/1381	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	19	4.56	425/1500	4.61	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	623/1517	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	12	6	4.00	898/1497	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	4	6	12	4.04	1170/1440	4.45	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	1024/1448	4.75	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	9	10	4.04	1034/1436	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	6	12	4.08	1000/1432	4.46	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	343/1221	4.51	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	3	4	7	3.58	1000/1280	4.14	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	623/1277	4.69	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	532/1269	4.72	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	832/ 854	3.20	3.82	4.02	4.00	2.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	20				
			? 0						

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1359
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	21	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	150/1285	4.90	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	265/1476	4.72	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	288/1412	4.59	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	136/1381	4.78	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	362/1500	4.62	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	320/1440	4.82	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	648/1436	4.46	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	24	4.79	316/1432	4.79	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	480/1221	4.22	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	1	4	9	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.16	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	580/1277	4.53	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	1	12	4.41	662/1269	4.41	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	12	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.82	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 7	General	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101
 Title POPULATION & SOCIETY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1360
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	5	15	13	4.24	909/1522	4.24	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	17	12	4.18	945/1522	4.18	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	6	8	17	4.21	794/1285	4.21	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	3	1	13	10	2	3.24	1382/1476	3.24	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	15	9	3	3.15	1310/1412	3.15	4.18	4.06	4.03	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	6	8	7	2	2.89	1319/1381	2.89	4.09	4.08	4.13	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	6	12	10	3.79	1161/1500	3.79	4.28	4.18	4.13	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	2	24	6	3.97	1407/1517	3.97	4.73	4.65	4.62	3.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	10	14	1	3.64	1215/1497	3.64	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	9	18	4.32	991/1440	4.32	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	25	4.60	1072/1448	4.60	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	12	15	4.24	896/1436	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	8	21	4.47	669/1432	4.47	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	0	6	13	10	3.84	733/1221	3.84	3.96	3.93	3.94	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	3	7	9	3	3.33	1106/1280	3.33	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	3	5	5	11	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	8	10	6	3.92	951/1269	3.92	4.51	4.31	4.39	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	16	1	3	2	2	0	2.63	****/ 854	****	3.82	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101
 Title POPULATION & SOCIETY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1360
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	6	Under-grad	34	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 321 8020
 Title RACE & ETHNIC RELATION
 Instructor: SUFIAN, MERYL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1361
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	6	2	3.58	1372/1522	3.58	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	1	3	3	3.25	1442/1522	3.25	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	2	5	0	3.00	1248/1285	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1363/1476	3.33	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	948/1412	3.83	4.18	4.06	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1097/1381	3.67	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1183/1500	3.75	4.28	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	4	0	3.40	1325/1497	3.40	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1287/1440	3.80	4.43	4.45	4.46	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1199/1448	4.45	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1261/1436	3.60	4.35	4.29	4.30	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	935/1432	4.18	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	2	0	3	3	3.09	1054/1221	3.09	3.96	3.93	3.94	3.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	859/1280	3.83	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	3	0	7	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	3	0	2	5	3.42	1141/1269	3.42	4.51	4.31	4.39	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	580/ 854	3.78	3.82	4.02	4.00	3.78	
Laboratory															
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 90
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1362
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	1	4	10	14	23	4.04	1101/1522	4.04	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	4	13	17	15	3.76	1262/1522	3.76	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	8	7	15	17	3.65	1129/1285	3.65	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	2	3	11	14	16	3.85	1155/1476	3.85	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	7	12	27	4.22	594/1412	4.22	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	3	8	18	15	3.83	1000/1381	3.83	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	2	2	9	15	19	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	1	0	1	2	45	4.84	645/1517	4.84	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	4	2	13	21	4	3.43	1310/1497	3.43	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	5	11	16	16	3.84	1276/1440	3.84	4.43	4.45	4.46	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	4	44	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	5	9	20	14	3.90	1161/1436	3.90	4.35	4.29	4.30	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	4	5	16	19	3.88	1139/1432	3.88	4.36	4.29	4.29	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	6	6	10	8	2	2.81	1119/1221	2.81	3.96	3.93	3.94	2.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	4	12	9	10	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	2	8	8	17	3.97	954/1277	3.97	4.43	4.34	4.38	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	1	5	30	4.61	509/1269	4.61	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	29	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	****/ 854	****	3.82	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 90
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1362
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	11	General	17	Under-grad	54	Non-major	54
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 335 0101
 Title TERRORISM & SOCIAL VIO
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1363
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	3	8	19	4.53	571/1522	4.53	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	23	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	8	3	13	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	1	3	0	9	4.31	556/1381	4.31	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	6	18	4.23	799/1500	4.23	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	421/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	1	24	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	521/1448	4.89	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	436/1436	4.64	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	2	4	8	9	3.92	686/1221	3.92	3.96	3.93	3.94	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	869/1280	3.81	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	885/1277	4.13	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.82	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 335 0101
 Title TERRORISM & SOCIAL VIO
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1363
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	31	Non-major	25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1364
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	10	16	4.45	681/1522	4.45	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	13	10	4.07	1048/1522	4.07	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	15	4.38	674/1285	4.38	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	14	13	4.34	692/1476	4.34	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	14	7	3.86	924/1412	3.86	4.18	4.06	4.03	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	11	11	4.18	683/1381	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	6	17	4.34	690/1500	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	7	8	7	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	11	14	4.34	976/1440	4.34	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	783/1448	4.79	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	10	13	4.21	927/1436	4.21	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	9	16	4.31	838/1432	4.31	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	5	10	9	3.89	707/1221	3.89	3.96	3.93	3.94	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	9	15	4.52	376/1280	4.52	4.16	4.10	4.14	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	580/1277	4.52	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	477/1269	4.64	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	21	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.82	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE
 Instructor: NOLIN, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1364
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 9	Under-grad 29 Non-major 29
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC
 Enrollment: 116
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1365
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	7	8	12	12	17	3.43	1433/1522	3.43	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	11	12	11	14	9	2.96	1486/1522	2.96	4.21	4.26	4.25	2.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	8	12	16	10	10	3.04	1245/1285	3.04	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	2	8	19	15	7	3.33	1363/1476	3.33	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	7	16	19	12	3.67	1077/1412	3.67	4.18	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	2	4	9	9	4	3.32	1231/1381	3.32	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	5	8	15	13	14	3.42	1351/1500	3.42	4.28	4.18	4.13	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	1	27	24	4.40	1169/1517	4.40	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	10	9	12	5	3	2.54	1475/1497	2.54	4.08	4.11	4.13	2.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	15	12	6	9	12	2.83	1420/1440	2.83	4.43	4.45	4.46	2.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	3	7	8	36	4.43	1224/1448	4.43	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	6	11	17	8	11	3.13	1368/1436	3.13	4.35	4.29	4.30	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	19	11	4	11	9	2.63	1395/1432	2.63	4.36	4.29	4.29	2.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	28	6	2	10	3	3	2.79	1123/1221	2.79	3.96	3.93	3.94	2.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	3	14	8	13	3.61	988/1280	3.61	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	4	7	9	20	4.13	891/1277	4.13	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	4	2	6	10	19	3.93	943/1269	3.93	4.51	4.31	4.39	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	11	3	2	6	9	10	3.70	608/ 854	3.70	3.82	4.02	4.00	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC
 Enrollment: 116
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1365
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	13	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1366
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	3	5	14	6	3.63	1351/1522	3.63	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	8	7	9	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	8	5	14	3.93	1000/1285	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	6	7	10	3.63	1263/1476	3.63	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	10	5	7	3.36	1248/1412	3.36	4.18	4.06	4.03	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	4	7	9	7	3.70	1076/1381	3.70	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	7	4	13	3.79	1154/1500	3.79	4.28	4.18	4.13	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	731/1517	4.79	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	2	10	7	1	3.35	1340/1497	3.35	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	7	4	15	3.93	1232/1440	3.93	4.43	4.45	4.46	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	5	21	4.53	1131/1448	4.53	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	7	10	8	3.63	1251/1436	3.63	4.35	4.29	4.30	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	9	11	3.73	1199/1432	3.73	4.36	4.29	4.29	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	7	1	3	1	5	2.76	1130/1221	2.76	3.96	3.93	3.94	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	7	6	3.70	941/1280	3.70	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	3	5	2	10	3.95	971/1277	3.95	4.43	4.34	4.38	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	864/1269	4.05	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	818/ 854	2.78	3.82	4.02	4.00	2.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 372 0101
 Title JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
 Instructor: KNAPP, ROLAND
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1367
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	9	11	4.03	1101/1522	4.03	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	10	3	9	3.45	1388/1522	3.45	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	8	11	3.93	1009/1285	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	12	9	3.93	1091/1476	3.93	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	9	11	8	3.86	924/1412	3.86	4.18	4.06	4.03	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	8	9	5	3.39	1202/1381	3.39	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	8	6	12	3.86	1111/1500	3.86	4.28	4.18	4.13	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	21	6	4.14	1337/1517	4.14	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	10	10	1	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	5	7	10	3.77	1301/1440	3.77	4.43	4.45	4.46	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	6	18	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	8	8	8	3.85	1181/1436	3.85	4.35	4.29	4.30	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	5	3	14	3.93	1108/1432	3.93	4.36	4.29	4.29	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	8	2	12	3.84	733/1221	3.84	3.96	3.93	3.94	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	2	5	2	5	3.38	1091/1280	3.38	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	5	4	5	3.63	1106/1277	3.63	4.43	4.34	4.38	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1066/1269	3.69	4.51	4.31	4.39	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	10	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 854	****	3.82	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 12 Under-grad 29 Non-major 23
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 2
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 8

Course-Section: SOCY 380 0101
 Title POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY
 Instructor: SECKIN, GUL
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1368
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	2	0	27	4.86	204/1522	4.86	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	488/1522	4.55	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	395/1285	4.64	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	197/1476	4.79	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	143/1412	4.79	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	92/1381	4.89	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	22	4.66	325/1500	4.66	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	911/1517	4.69	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	326/1497	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	452/1440	4.76	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	346/1448	4.93	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	394/1436	4.69	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	502/1432	4.62	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	1	23	4.70	150/1221	4.70	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	191/1280	4.79	4.16	4.10	4.14	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	266/1269	4.86	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	407/ 854	4.11	3.82	4.02	4.00	4.11	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 30	Non-major 30
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1369
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	656/1522	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	244/1522	4.77	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1285	4.83	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	161/1412	4.77	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	382/1381	4.45	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	275/1500	4.70	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1325/1517	4.15	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	751/1440	4.55	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	916/1448	4.73	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	660/1436	4.45	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	590/1432	4.55	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1280	4.88	4.16	4.10	4.14	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1277	4.88	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	3.82	4.02	4.00	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	11						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 397A 0101
 Title MEDIA AND SOCIETY
 Instructor: TUFEKCIOGLU, ZE
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1370
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	5	13	4.25	899/1522	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	4	12	4.17	955/1522	4.17	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	4	12	3.92	1018/1285	3.92	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	2	1	6	10	3.95	1068/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	5	13	4.17	646/1412	4.17	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	6	9	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	5	14	4.30	731/1500	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	247/1448	4.96	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	720/1436	4.41	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	811/1432	4.35	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	156/1221	4.70	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	6	1	11	4.28	572/1280	4.28	4.16	4.10	4.14	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.51	4.31	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	2	1	3	4	6	3.69	616/ 854	3.69	3.82	4.02	4.00	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 24	Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	0			

Course-Section: SOCY 397B 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL SOCIOLOG
 Instructor: MACLENNAN, JAMI
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1371
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	4	15	4.35	802/1522	4.35	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	12	4.09	1037/1522	4.09	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	3	12	4.25	604/1381	4.25	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	0	7	11	4.30	731/1500	4.30	4.28	4.18	4.13	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	600/1517	4.85	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	931/1440	4.40	4.43	4.45	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	494/1448	4.90	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.35	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	0	1	15	4.25	884/1432	4.25	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	351/1221	4.41	3.96	3.93	3.94	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	214/1280	4.77	4.16	4.10	4.14	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	340/1277	4.79	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.51	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	267/ 854	4.38	3.82	4.02	4.00	4.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1372
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	2	9	13	4.46	669/1522	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.21	4.26	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	8	10	4.04	734/1412	4.04	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	297/1381	4.55	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	3	4	12	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.28	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	718/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	96/1440	4.96	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	247/1448	4.96	4.78	4.71	4.75	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	478/1436	4.61	4.35	4.29	4.32	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	418/1432	4.70	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	3	6	8	3.95	782/1280	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.28	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	1	14	4.37	721/1277	4.37	4.43	4.34	4.50	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	351/1269	4.79	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.82	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 23 Non-major 11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1373
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	1	3	15	4.48	643/1522	4.48	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.21	4.26	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	682/1476	4.35	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	15	4.48	366/1412	4.48	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	458/1381	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	17	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.28	4.18	4.25	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	784/1517	4.76	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	622/1497	4.29	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	765/1448	4.81	4.78	4.71	4.75	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	467/1436	4.62	4.35	4.29	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	16	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	5	2	13	4.29	442/1221	4.29	3.96	3.93	4.04	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	515/1280	4.35	4.16	4.10	4.28	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.43	4.34	4.50	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	437/1269	4.70	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	3.82	4.02	4.31	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 431 0101
 Title FAMILY/AGING IN SOCIET
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1373
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	11	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 433 0101
 Title GENDER, WORK, AND FAMI
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1374
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	8	4.78	290/1522	4.78	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1522	4.89	4.21	4.26	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1476	4.89	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1412	4.89	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	92/1381	4.89	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.28	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.78	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1436	4.88	4.35	4.29	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	380/1221	4.38	3.96	3.93	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.16	4.10	4.28	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.43	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.51	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	166/ 854	4.60	3.82	4.02	4.31	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 451 0101
 Title SOCY OF HEALTH & ILLNE
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1375
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	14	4.76	305/1522	4.76	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	310/1522	4.71	4.21	4.26	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	212/1285	4.82	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	336/1476	4.65	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	161/1412	4.76	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	220/1381	4.65	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	263/1500	4.71	4.28	4.18	4.25	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	320/1440	4.82	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.78	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	198/1436	4.82	4.35	4.29	4.32	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	267/1432	4.82	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	150/1221	4.71	3.96	3.93	4.04	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	161/1280	4.86	4.16	4.10	4.28	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.43	4.34	4.50	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	178/1269	4.93	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	608/ 854	3.70	3.82	4.02	4.31	3.70	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: Socy 497 0101
 Title Selected Topics: SAS
 Instructor: ~~Miller, Janet~~ Miller, Jayne
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 5
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	****	4.69	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	322/1522	****	4.64	4.26	4.18	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1285	****	4.72	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	****	4.58	4.22	4.09	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	231/1412	****	4.57	4.06	4.01	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	207/1381	****	4.28	4.08	3.93	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	275/1500	****	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	487/1517	****	4.72	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	654/1497	****	4.43	4.11	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	192/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	****	4.95	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	383/1436	****	4.57	4.29	4.24	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1432	****	4.55	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	99/1221	****	3.94	3.93	3.86	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	****	4.72	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	****	4.80	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	****	4.82	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	194/ 854	****	4.55	4.02	3.87	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 497B 0101
 Title HLTH & ILLNESS 21ST CE
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1376
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	1	10	4.29	869/1522	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	670/1522	4.43	4.21	4.26	4.34	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	682/1476	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	81/1412	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	713/1381	4.14	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.28	4.18	4.25	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	602/1497	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	392/1440	4.79	4.43	4.45	4.52	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.78	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	357/1436	4.71	4.35	4.29	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	316/1432	4.79	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1197/1221	2.00	3.96	3.93	4.04	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.16	4.10	4.28	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.43	4.34	4.50	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	3.82	4.02	4.31	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	1			

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0101
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1377
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	1	2	14	4.76	305/1522	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.45	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	383/1522	4.57	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	204/1285	4.73	4.34	4.30	4.31	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	582/1476	4.55	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	274/1412	4.45	4.18	4.06	4.25	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	305/1381	4.57	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	119/1500	4.94	4.28	4.18	4.22	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.97	4.73	4.65	4.73	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	312/1497	4.59	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	224/1440	4.82	4.43	4.45	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	548/1448	4.82	4.78	4.71	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	601/1436	4.63	4.35	4.29	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	327/1432	4.76	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	303/1221	4.55	3.96	3.93	3.83	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	598/1280	4.40	4.16	4.10	4.24	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	573/1277	4.70	4.43	4.34	4.52	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	743/1269	4.58	4.51	4.31	4.51	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	314/ 854	4.14	3.82	4.02	4.08	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7	Graduate	7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	11
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0201
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: FLOW-DELWICHE,
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1378
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4	4.38	767/1522	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	545/1522	4.57	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	405/1285	4.73	4.34	4.30	4.31	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	316/1476	4.55	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	538/1412	4.45	4.18	4.06	4.25	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1381	4.57	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1500	4.94	4.28	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	4.97	4.73	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	333/1497	4.59	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	452/1440	4.82	4.43	4.45	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	859/1448	4.82	4.78	4.71	4.80	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	295/1436	4.63	4.35	4.29	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	350/1432	4.76	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	200/1221	4.55	3.96	3.93	3.83	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	343/1280	4.40	4.16	4.10	4.24	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.70	4.43	4.34	4.52	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.58	4.51	4.31	4.51	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.14	3.82	4.02	4.08	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.61	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.25	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.25	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.50	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0201
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: FLOW-DELWICHE,
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1378
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 606 0101
 Title SOC INEQUALITY/SOC POL
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1379
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	3	7	4.08	1074/1522	4.08	4.25	4.30	4.45	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.31	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	420/1412	4.42	4.18	4.06	4.25	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	4.09	4.08	4.25	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.28	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	784/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.73	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.43	4.45	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.78	4.71	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1221	****	3.96	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	834/1280	3.89	4.16	4.10	4.24	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	827/1277	4.22	4.43	4.34	4.52	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.51	4.31	4.51	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	652/ 854	3.60	3.82	4.02	4.08	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.50	4.58	4.76	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	57/ 77	4.25	4.25	4.52	4.70	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	54/ 65	4.00	4.00	4.49	4.71	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	59/ 78	4.25	4.25	4.45	4.66	4.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	62/ 80	3.50	3.50	4.11	4.38	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: SOCY 606 0101
 Title SOC INEQUALITY/SOC POL
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1379
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 619 0101
 Title QUALITATIVE METHODS
 Instructor: CARDER, PAULA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1380
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	7	7	4	3.52	1394/1522	3.52	4.25	4.30	4.45	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	9	3	3.38	1408/1522	3.38	4.21	4.26	4.29	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1285	****	4.34	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	5	6	3.48	1331/1476	3.48	4.14	4.22	4.31	3.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	5	5	7	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	4.18	4.06	4.25	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	9	5	3.71	1070/1381	3.71	4.09	4.08	4.25	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	7	6	3.65	1240/1500	3.65	4.28	4.18	4.22	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	4	10	2	3.58	1250/1497	3.58	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	6	8	4	3.74	1311/1440	3.74	4.43	4.45	4.48	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.78	4.71	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1117/1436	3.94	4.35	4.29	4.37	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	9	5	3.84	1152/1432	3.84	4.36	4.29	4.33	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	5	5	6	3.72	803/1221	3.72	3.96	3.93	3.83	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	782/1280	3.94	4.16	4.10	4.24	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	682/1277	4.41	4.43	4.34	4.52	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	524/1269	4.59	4.51	4.31	4.51	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.82	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 13 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 8 Non-major 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 684 8020
 Title NONPROFIT ORGANIZ SOC
 Instructor: HALL, NANCY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1381
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.14	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.28	4.18	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.73	4.65	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.43	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.78	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.35	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	408/1221	4.33	3.96	3.93	3.83	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.16	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.43	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.51	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	3.82	4.02	4.08	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant