

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E
 Enrollment: 185
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1354
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	7	30	26	4.23	914/1504	3.78	4.20	4.27	4.13	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	10	33	19	4.05	1027/1503	3.73	4.19	4.20	4.16	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	14	19	29	4.09	898/1290	4.04	4.25	4.28	4.19	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	52	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	****/1453	3.44	4.17	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	14	24	23	3.98	768/1421	3.70	4.02	4.00	3.91	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	53	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	****/1365	3.17	4.00	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	22	40	4.53	423/1485	4.02	4.26	4.16	4.13	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	60	5	4.08	1392/1504	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.66	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	16	28	15	3.95	919/1483	3.57	3.95	4.06	3.97	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	14	48	4.69	525/1425	4.44	4.48	4.41	4.36	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	59	4.89	525/1426	4.61	4.74	4.69	4.56	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	21	39	4.52	552/1418	4.14	4.32	4.25	4.20	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	20	39	4.52	613/1416	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.21	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	10	20	29	4.28	471/1199	4.01	3.89	3.97	3.82	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	2	10	5	14	4.00	716/1312	3.51	4.22	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	3	1	8	6	12	3.77	1044/1303	3.44	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	2	2	12	15	4.29	774/1299	4.01	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	36	23	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/ 758	3.00	4.00	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	63	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0101
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: TRELA, JAMES E
 Enrollment: 185
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1354
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	1	B	29						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	13	C	14	General	11	Under-grad	66	Non-major	66
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0201
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 82
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1355
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	5	9	19	17	3.96	1132/1504	3.78	4.20	4.27	4.13	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	11	20	16	4.00	1052/1503	3.73	4.19	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	18	25	4.32	721/1290	4.04	4.25	4.28	4.19	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	8	19	17	4.02	990/1453	3.44	4.17	4.21	4.11	4.02
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	7	13	25	4.14	642/1421	3.70	4.02	4.00	3.91	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	12	15	16	3.80	974/1365	3.17	4.00	4.08	3.96	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	9	12	28	4.34	659/1485	4.02	4.26	4.16	4.13	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	7	28	13	4.08	1389/1504	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.66	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	1	9	19	8	3.84	1051/1483	3.57	3.95	4.06	3.97	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	6	16	23	4.33	981/1425	4.44	4.48	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	10	34	4.71	895/1426	4.61	4.74	4.69	4.56	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	7	19	18	4.15	939/1418	4.14	4.32	4.25	4.20	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	6	18	18	4.04	1015/1416	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.21	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	7	19	20	4.28	471/1199	4.01	3.89	3.97	3.82	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	2	5	10	11	4.07	697/1312	3.51	4.22	4.00	3.69	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	5	9	12	4.07	893/1303	3.44	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	523/1299	4.01	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	22	12	1	4	6	2	3	3.13	670/ 758	3.00	4.00	4.01	3.80	3.13
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 18	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 18						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	9	C 6	General	12	Under-grad	50	Non-major	50
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	11				
				? 0						

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0301
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: Ma, Yingyi
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1356
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	7	9	14	6	3.39	1393/1504	3.78	4.20	4.27	4.13	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	8	11	10	3.50	1304/1503	3.73	4.19	4.20	4.16	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	16	12	3.92	1005/1290	4.04	4.25	4.28	4.19	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	7	10	11	3	3.06	1399/1453	3.44	4.17	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	15	8	10	3.55	1084/1421	3.70	4.02	4.00	3.91	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	9	4	10	5	4	2.72	1332/1365	3.17	4.00	4.08	3.96	2.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	6	9	11	7	3.30	1340/1485	4.02	4.26	4.16	4.13	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	30	5	4.11	1376/1504	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	4	13	10	3	3.32	1306/1483	3.57	3.95	4.06	3.97	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	7	13	15	4.08	1136/1425	4.44	4.48	4.41	4.36	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	10	22	4.41	1197/1426	4.61	4.74	4.69	4.56	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	8	13	9	3.69	1193/1418	4.14	4.32	4.25	4.20	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	5	15	9	3.69	1194/1416	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.21	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	4	5	13	10	3.66	864/1199	4.01	3.89	3.97	3.82	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	4	9	13	4	3.33	1070/1312	3.51	4.22	4.00	3.69	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	3	7	7	16	4.00	910/1303	3.44	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	5	7	20	4.32	750/1299	4.01	4.46	4.25	3.94	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	4	6	5	5	3	2.87	714/ 758	3.00	4.00	4.01	3.80	2.87
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	18	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	18
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 1	B 23		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 8	C 1	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 123
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1357
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	4	9	10	13	3.54	1343/1504	3.78	4.20	4.27	4.13	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	8	13	9	3.39	1351/1503	3.73	4.19	4.20	4.16	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	4	6	11	16	3.83	1054/1290	4.04	4.25	4.28	4.19	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	5	1	7	5	6	3.25	1366/1453	3.44	4.17	4.21	4.11	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	23	5	2	3	2	6	3.11	1286/1421	3.70	4.02	4.00	3.91	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	4	1	2	3	3	3.00	1296/1365	3.17	4.00	4.08	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	4	10	19	3.90	1086/1485	4.02	4.26	4.16	4.13	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1504	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	3	4	14	9	3	3.15	1355/1483	3.57	3.95	4.06	3.97	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	6	30	4.67	572/1425	4.44	4.48	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	5	9	25	4.43	1183/1426	4.61	4.74	4.69	4.56	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	10	20	4.21	887/1418	4.14	4.32	4.25	4.20	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	3	5	11	14	3.76	1167/1416	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.21	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	1	8	14	12	3.82	790/1199	4.01	3.89	3.97	3.82	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	9	4	7	2	5	2.63	1230/1312	3.51	4.22	4.00	3.69	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	15	3	6	2	1	1.93	1283/1303	3.44	4.39	4.24	3.93	1.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	8	2	6	8	3	2.85	1220/1299	4.01	4.46	4.25	3.94	2.85
4. Were special techniques successful	14	23	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 758	3.00	4.00	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SOCY 101 0401
 Title BASIC CONCEPTS IN SOCY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 123
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1357
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 204 0101
 Title DIVERSITY & PLURALISM
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1358
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	6	8	13	3.81	1239/1504	3.81	4.20	4.27	4.26	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	13	6	10	3.66	1251/1503	3.66	4.19	4.20	4.18	3.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	7	15	3.94	996/1290	3.94	4.25	4.28	4.27	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	7	5	13	3.80	1168/1453	3.80	4.17	4.21	4.20	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	7	7	16	4.09	685/1421	4.09	4.02	4.00	3.90	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	8	5	14	3.93	866/1365	3.93	4.00	4.08	4.00	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	9	12	3.84	1122/1485	3.84	4.26	4.16	4.15	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	21	4.68	976/1504	4.68	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	2	7	13	2	3.52	1225/1483	3.52	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	2	13	12	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.48	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	10	19	4.41	1197/1426	4.41	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	5	10	12	3.94	1072/1418	3.94	4.32	4.25	4.22	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	8	7	13	3.84	1126/1416	3.84	4.31	4.26	4.24	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	7	9	10	3.93	725/1199	3.93	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	474/1312	4.39	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	344/1303	4.76	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	556/1299	4.52	4.46	4.25	4.21	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	268/ 758	4.35	4.00	4.01	3.89	4.35

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	32	Non-major	26
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 204H 0101
 Title DIVERSITY&PLURALISM HO
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1359
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1403/1504	3.33	4.20	4.27	4.26	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.83	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1453	4.17	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.02	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	947/1365	3.83	4.00	4.08	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.26	4.16	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.48	4.41	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.32	4.25	4.22	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1145/1416	3.80	4.31	4.26	4.24	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	884/1199	3.60	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	508/ 758	3.75	4.00	4.01	3.89	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: SPURGAS, ALYSON
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1360
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	9	10	4.08	1056/1504	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	13	7	4.08	1002/1503	4.04	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	10	4.12	880/1290	3.74	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	10	4.20	844/1453	4.10	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	9	9	3.92	839/1421	3.79	4.02	4.00	4.01	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	737/1365	3.87	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	682/1485	4.16	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	691/1504	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1009/1483	3.84	3.95	4.06	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	736/1425	4.63	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	1212/1426	4.54	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	11	8	4.08	987/1418	4.13	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	977/1416	4.20	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	11	6	3.87	766/1199	3.77	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	5	7	4	3.61	971/1312	3.73	4.22	4.00	4.09	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	851/1303	4.21	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	741/1299	4.14	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	1	2	8	5	3.88	476/ 758	3.85	4.00	4.01	4.00	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0101
 Title METHODODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: SPURGAS, ALYSON
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1360
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201
 Title METHODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1361
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	7	10	3.96	1132/1504	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.27	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	7	11	4.00	1052/1503	4.04	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	3	7	3.36	1185/1290	3.74	4.25	4.28	4.31	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	6	11	4.00	1001/1453	4.10	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	9	7	5	3.65	1023/1421	3.79	4.02	4.00	4.01	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	8	5	3.65	1072/1365	3.87	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	3	6	10	4.00	990/1485	4.16	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1064/1504	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	1	1	3	10	4	3.79	1105/1483	3.84	3.95	4.06	4.08	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	492/1425	4.63	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	20	4.71	913/1426	4.54	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	3	14	4.17	922/1418	4.13	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	854/1416	4.20	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	0	7	6	8	3.67	860/1199	3.77	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	5	5	8	3.85	845/1312	3.73	4.22	4.00	4.09	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	796/1303	4.21	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	966/1299	4.14	4.46	4.25	4.30	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	493/ 758	3.85	4.00	4.01	4.00	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 300 0201
 Title METHODODOLOGY:SOCIAL RSR
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1361
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1362
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	509/1504	4.53	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	324/1503	4.66	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	322/1290	4.69	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	418/1453	4.53	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	8	15	4.29	524/1421	4.29	4.02	4.00	4.01	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	270/1485	4.69	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	13	4.41	1173/1504	4.41	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	234/1483	4.64	3.95	4.06	4.08	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	331/1425	4.81	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	247/1418	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	255/1416	4.81	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	603/1199	4.09	3.89	3.97	4.02	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.22	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	460/1303	4.65	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	537/1299	4.55	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	12	15	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 301 0101
 Title ANALY:SOCIOLOGICAL DAT
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1362
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	9	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	8
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 315 0101
 Title POPULATION & SOCIETY
 Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1363
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	800/1504	4.32	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	10	4.28	816/1503	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	721/1290	4.32	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	643/1453	4.37	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	8	6	3	3.13	1279/1421	3.13	4.02	4.00	4.01	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	3	12	1	3.40	1201/1365	3.40	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	7	10	3.96	1028/1485	3.96	4.26	4.16	4.17	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	4.52	1075/1504	4.52	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	2	16	2	3.82	1082/1483	3.82	3.95	4.06	4.08	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	712/1425	4.57	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	451/1426	4.91	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	10	9	4.17	922/1418	4.17	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	662/1416	4.48	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	3	3	8	6	3.59	887/1199	3.59	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	864/1312	3.82	4.22	4.00	4.09	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	551/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	705/1299	4.38	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 16	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 20
				P 0	
				I 0	
				Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 101
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1364
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	6	17	38	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	11	19	30	4.21	902/1503	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	10	18	30	4.11	887/1290	4.11	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	11	21	26	4.13	912/1453	4.13	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	9	8	43	4.43	392/1421	4.43	4.02	4.00	4.01	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	11	18	28	4.06	748/1365	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	11	16	34	4.34	670/1485	4.34	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	2	59	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	3	1	7	20	22	4.08	810/1483	4.08	3.95	4.06	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	13	25	21	4.02	1161/1425	4.02	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	59	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	8	28	22	4.10	984/1418	4.10	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	7	13	40	4.45	688/1416	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	12	5	12	11	7	2.91	1093/1199	2.91	3.89	3.97	4.02	2.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	7	9	30	4.45	424/1312	4.45	4.22	4.00	4.09	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	4	6	5	31	4.30	770/1303	4.30	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	1	3	4	37	4.55	537/1299	4.55	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	18	37	2	0	5	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	62	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 333 0101
 Title HUM SEXUALITY/CROSS-CU
 Instructor: LOTTES, ILSA L.
 Enrollment: 101
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1364
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	19	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	18
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	12	C	17	General	27	Under-grad	63	Non-major	46
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	18	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 335 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF VIOLENCE
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1365
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	455/1504	4.57	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	14	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	20	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	810/1453	4.22	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	911/1421	3.84	4.02	4.00	4.01	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1365	****	4.00	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	6	16	4.36	648/1485	4.36	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	518/1483	4.35	3.95	4.06	4.08	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	676/1425	4.59	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	462/1418	4.59	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	243/1416	4.81	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	3	1	2	1	7	3.57	894/1199	3.57	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	4	1	8	3.69	937/1312	3.69	4.22	4.00	4.09	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	5	3	6	3.69	1069/1303	3.69	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	6	2	6	3.69	1073/1299	3.69	4.46	4.25	4.30	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 335 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF VIOLENCE
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1365
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 345 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1366
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	17	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	14	4.34	736/1503	4.34	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	9	13	4.14	873/1290	4.14	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	7	16	4.36	656/1453	4.36	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	20	4.43	383/1421	4.43	4.02	4.00	4.01	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	3	16	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	8	12	2	3	2.85	1498/1504	2.85	4.67	4.69	4.65	2.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	15	6	4.08	804/1483	4.08	3.95	4.06	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	676/1425	4.59	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	913/1426	4.70	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	539/1418	4.54	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	534/1416	4.59	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	4	5	6	5	3.36	977/1199	3.36	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	483/1312	4.38	4.22	4.00	4.09	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	7	2	5	3.63	549/ 758	3.63	4.00	4.01	4.00	3.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 345 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED L
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1366
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	30	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 352 0101
 Title ISSUES IN HEALTH CARE
 Instructor: STUART, MARY
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1367
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	2	8	17	4.34	775/1504	4.34	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	11	14	4.28	827/1503	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	1	9	16	4.36	691/1290	4.36	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	3	10	11	3.83	927/1421	3.83	4.02	4.00	4.01	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	5	2	3	2	5	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	9	6	12	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	11	7	8	3.88	1009/1483	3.88	3.95	4.06	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	9	13	4.17	1088/1425	4.17	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	9	17	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	10	16	4.31	821/1416	4.31	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	4	5	17	4.41	369/1199	4.41	3.89	3.97	4.02	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	177/1303	4.92	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	19	9	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	31	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 96
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1368
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	4	15	11	15	3.70	1290/1504	3.70	4.20	4.27	4.27	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	9	14	20	4.02	1039/1503	4.02	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	1	11	11	22	4.06	911/1290	4.06	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	3	2	12	10	11	3.63	1241/1453	3.63	4.17	4.21	4.23	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	11	9	22	4.02	731/1421	4.02	4.02	4.00	4.01	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	5	6	15	9	10	3.29	1241/1365	3.29	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	0	6	8	30	4.39	602/1485	4.39	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	4	16	26	4.48	1112/1504	4.48	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	2	0	16	12	6	3.56	1215/1483	3.56	3.95	4.06	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	13	8	23	4.13	1111/1425	4.13	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	9	34	4.64	1008/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	13	10	20	4.02	1006/1418	4.02	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	8	12	20	3.93	1078/1416	3.93	4.31	4.26	4.27	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	3	3	12	6	21	3.87	766/1199	3.87	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	4	7	5	17	3.97	745/1312	3.97	4.22	4.00	4.09	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	3	3	3	25	4.47	596/1303	4.47	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	4	6	23	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	2	1	11	4	7	3.52	575/ 758	3.52	4.00	4.01	4.00	3.52
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 353 0101
 Title MARRIAGE AND THE FAMIL
 Instructor: Tufekcioglu, Ze
 Enrollment: 96
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1368
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	9	C	12	General	17	Under-grad	50	Non-major	46
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY A
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1369
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	7	9	3.96	1143/1504	3.96	4.20	4.27	4.27	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	805/1503	4.29	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	8	9	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	4	5	11	4.05	718/1421	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.01	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	6	7	8	3.95	842/1365	3.95	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	705/1485	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	8	9	3	3.67	1170/1483	3.67	3.95	4.06	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	1117/1425	4.13	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	1190/1426	4.42	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	1	10	9	3.96	1055/1418	3.96	4.32	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	3	12	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	8	2	5	3.44	946/1199	3.44	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	483/1312	4.38	4.22	4.00	4.09	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	546/1303	4.54	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	550/1299	4.54	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	354/ 758	4.14	4.00	4.01	4.00	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 354 0101
 Title SOC BASES:PUBL/COMM HL
 Instructor: BREWER, MARY A
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1369
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	16
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SOCY 372 0101
 Title JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
 Instructor: Knapp, Roland
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1370
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	3	8	9	3.76	1262/1504	3.76	4.20	4.27	4.27	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	12	5	3.64	1255/1503	3.64	4.19	4.20	4.22	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	7	9	3.76	1075/1290	3.76	4.25	4.28	4.31	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	9	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	7	6	7	3.63	1043/1421	3.63	4.02	4.00	4.01	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	3	9	3	3.53	1143/1365	3.53	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	14	4.32	682/1485	4.32	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	4.36	1200/1504	4.36	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	8	7	3	3.32	1310/1483	3.32	3.95	4.06	4.08	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	3	2	6	7	3.79	1250/1425	3.79	4.48	4.41	4.43	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	2	0	6	11	4.37	1217/1426	4.37	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	4	10	2	3.58	1232/1418	3.58	4.32	4.25	4.26	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	3	6	7	3.79	1153/1416	3.79	4.31	4.26	4.27	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	820/1199	3.75	3.89	3.97	4.02	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1093/1312	3.25	4.22	4.00	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	1145/1303	3.38	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1106/1299	3.50	4.46	4.25	4.30	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 396 0101
 Title COMM SERV & LEARN INTE
 Instructor: WOLFF, MICHELE
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1371
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.25	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.02	4.00	4.01	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	731/1365	4.09	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	230/1485	4.73	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	879/1504	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	804/1483	4.08	3.95	4.06	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	161/1425	4.92	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	113/1418	4.92	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	221/1416	4.83	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1199	****	3.89	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.22	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.91	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	203/1299	4.91	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.00	4.01	4.00	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	11						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 397 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN SOC
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1372
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	250/1504	4.77	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	556/1503	4.46	4.19	4.20	4.22	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.02	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	613/1485	4.38	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1483	4.70	3.95	4.06	4.08	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.48	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	0	3	6	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	349/1199	4.43	3.89	3.97	4.02	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	310/1312	4.58	4.22	4.00	4.09	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.46	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	94/ 758	4.78	4.00	4.01	4.00	4.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: SOCY 397 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS IN SOC
 Instructor: SERVATIUS, NANC
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1372
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1373
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	10	15	4.30	826/1504	4.30	4.20	4.27	4.33	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	10	15	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	322/1290	4.69	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	705/1453	4.31	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	5	4	15	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.02	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.00	4.08	4.09	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	13	14	4.41	577/1485	4.41	4.26	4.16	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	543/1483	4.33	3.95	4.06	4.11	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	300/1425	4.82	4.48	4.41	4.38	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	690/1426	4.82	4.74	4.69	4.72	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	488/1418	4.57	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	20	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1199	****	3.89	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	6	3	6	3.81	870/1312	3.81	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	488/1303	4.63	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1299	4.63	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: SOCY 409 0101
 Title SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY
 Instructor: COHEN, JERE M
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1373
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	22
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	13	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 419 0101
 Title QUAL METH SOCIAL RESRC
 Instructor: SAN ANTONIO, PA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1374
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	750/1504	4.37	4.20	4.27	4.33	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	946/1503	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.18	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1290	****	4.25	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	729/1453	4.29	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	11	4.05	712/1421	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	14	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	2	4	6	3.26	1346/1485	3.26	4.26	4.16	4.14	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.95	4.06	4.11	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	700/1425	4.58	4.48	4.41	4.38	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	525/1426	4.89	4.74	4.69	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	552/1418	4.53	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	904/1416	4.21	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.89	3.97	4.05	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	350/1312	4.53	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	469/1303	4.65	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	283/1299	4.82	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.17	4.00

Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****

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	10	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	9	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOCY 451 0101
 Title SOCY OF HEALTH & ILLNE
 Instructor: SCHUMACHER, JOH
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1375
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	228/1504	4.79	4.20	4.27	4.33	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	190/1503	4.79	4.19	4.20	4.18	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1290	4.93	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	172/1453	4.79	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	182/1421	4.71	4.02	4.00	4.02	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	472/1365	4.36	4.00	4.08	4.09	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	240/1485	4.71	4.26	4.16	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.95	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	603/1425	4.64	4.48	4.41	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.74	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	438/1418	4.62	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	554/1416	4.57	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	349/1199	4.43	3.89	3.97	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	89/1312	4.93	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	321/1303	4.79	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	162/1299	4.93	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	111/ 758	4.73	4.00	4.01	4.17	4.73

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 455 0101
 Title DISABILITY AND REHAB
 Instructor: KELLEY-MOORE, J
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1376
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	79/1504	4.94	4.20	4.27	4.33	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	119/1503	4.89	4.19	4.20	4.18	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	145/1290	4.89	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	112/1453	4.89	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	101/1421	4.88	4.02	4.00	4.02	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	111/1365	4.81	4.00	4.08	4.09	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.26	4.16	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	195/1483	4.69	3.95	4.06	4.11	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	107/1425	4.95	4.48	4.41	4.38	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	76/1418	4.94	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	85/1416	4.94	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	771/1199	3.86	3.89	3.97	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	153/1312	4.82	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.17	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	42/ 76	4.77	4.88	4.61	4.63	4.77
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	34/ 70	4.69	4.85	4.35	4.63	4.69
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	33/ 67	4.62	4.81	4.34	4.34	4.62
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	36/ 76	4.71	4.86	4.44	4.51	4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	28/ 73	4.57	4.62	4.17	4.29	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	12	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 604 0101
 Title STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: ADLER, MARINA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1377
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	295/1504	4.72	4.20	4.27	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	678/1503	4.39	4.19	4.20	4.28	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.25	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	798/1453	4.24	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	6	3.88	879/1421	3.88	4.02	4.00	4.27	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	738/1485	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.24	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.78	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	373/1483	4.47	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	107/1425	4.94	4.48	4.41	4.51	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.74	4.69	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	354/1418	4.69	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	394/1416	4.71	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	99/1199	4.82	3.89	3.97	4.04	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	869/1303	4.13	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.56	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	4.24	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 10 Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 606 0101
 Title SOC INEQUALITY/SOC POL
 Instructor: HEWITT, CHRIS J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1378
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	1199/1504	3.89	4.20	4.27	4.44	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	8	3.84	1164/1503	3.84	4.19	4.20	4.28	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	866/1290	4.14	4.25	4.28	4.36	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	855/1453	4.19	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.02	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	748/1365	4.07	4.00	4.08	4.35	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	6	7	3.84	1122/1485	3.84	4.26	4.16	4.24	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.95	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1179/1483	3.65	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	1147/1425	4.05	4.48	4.41	4.51	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1008/1426	4.63	4.74	4.69	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	1103/1416	3.89	4.31	4.26	4.38	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	3	0	2	1	4	3.30	997/1199	3.30	3.89	3.97	4.04	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	454/1312	4.41	4.22	4.00	4.31	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	719/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	344/1299	4.76	4.46	4.25	4.56	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	364/ 758	4.13	4.00	4.01	4.24	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 70	****	4.85	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.81	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 76	****	4.86	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.62	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		12
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0
I 0
? 3

Other

13

responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOCY 658 0101
 Title SOC MENTAL HEALTH
 Instructor: COTTEN, SHELIA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1379
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	442/1504	4.59	4.20	4.27	4.44	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	472/1503	4.53	4.19	4.20	4.28	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	547/1290	4.47	4.25	4.28	4.36	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	656/1453	4.35	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	347/1421	4.47	4.02	4.00	4.27	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	407/1365	4.41	4.00	4.08	4.35	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	309/1485	4.65	4.26	4.16	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	812/1504	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	493/1483	4.38	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	300/1425	4.82	4.48	4.41	4.51	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.74	4.69	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	178/1418	4.82	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	472/1416	4.65	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	224/1199	4.59	3.89	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.22	4.00	4.31	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	142/1299	4.93	4.46	4.25	4.56	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	293/ 758	4.29	4.00	4.01	4.24	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOCY 683 8010
 Title THE ORG STRUCT NONPROF
 Instructor: Hall, Nancy
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1380
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.20	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.19	4.20	4.28	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1175/1421	3.40	4.02	4.00	4.27	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.00	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.26	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.60	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.60

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.48	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.31	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.89	3.97	4.04	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.22	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.46	4.25	4.56	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.24	4.00

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.88	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.85	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.81	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.86	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 73	4.67	4.62	4.17	4.15	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOCY 698B 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPIC IN SOC:S
 Instructor: scerbo, Margori
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1381
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1285/1504	3.71	4.20	4.27	4.44	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.19	4.20	4.28	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1042/1290	3.86	4.25	4.28	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1175/1421	3.40	4.02	4.00	4.27	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	890/1485	4.14	4.26	4.16	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.48	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1232/1426	4.33	4.74	4.69	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.32	4.25	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1131/1416	3.83	4.31	4.26	4.38	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	860/1199	3.67	3.89	3.97	4.04	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.22	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.56	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 3 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6 Under-grad 4 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant