```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1109
Title         INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH           Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                     Fall   2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      42
Questionnaires:  25                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                      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  0  9  8  6  3.64 1459/1674  3.32  4.07  4.27  4.07  3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  5  6 13  4.20 1001/1674  3.82  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  0  3 20  4.75  262/1423  4.51  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  12  2  1  3  3  4  3.46 1464/1609  3.30  4.12  4.22  4.05  3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   6  0  2  5  4  7  3.89  926/1585  3.61  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6  6  3  3  3  3  2.67 1499/1535  2.96  4.17  4.08  3.89  2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  1  0  2 20  4.78  197/1651  4.42  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  2  2 20  4.75  958/1673  4.81  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  1  1  7  9  3  3.57 1344/1656  3.57  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.57

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  4  7 14  4.40 1004/1586  4.33  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  3  4 18  4.60 1142/1585  4.66  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  3  1  4  8  9  3.76 1296/1582  3.97  4.13  4.26  4.17  3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  2  3  5 13  4.00 1138/1575  3.93  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 13  2  2  4  0  4  3.17 1190/1380  3.24  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.17

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  5  0  4  5  6  3.35 1243/1520  3.24  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  3  3  2  3  8  3.53 1297/1515  3.66  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  4  1  6  0  7  3.28 1366/1511  3.67  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.28
4. Were special techniques successful                   6  13  1  2  0  0  3  3.33 ****/ 994  2.57  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   20  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0  1  0  2  0  1  3.00 ****/ 278  3.29  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 260  3.40  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            22  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  3.00  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20  4.00  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  2  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 2  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     21  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 21  1  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  22  0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  22  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        21  1  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    21  1  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  21  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.30  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     21  0  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       21  2  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        21  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      21  2  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0101                    University of Maryland                    Page 1109
Title           INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH              Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     SONG, YOON J                       Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     42
Questionnaires: 25                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3         0.00-0.99    1       A     4        Required for Majors  19     Graduate      0       Major        0
28-55      2         1.00-1.99    0       B     5
56-83      2         2.00-2.99    2       C    13        General               1     Under-grad   25       Non-major   25
84-150     2         3.00-3.49    4       D     1
Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    1       F     0        Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P     0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I     0        Other                 2
                                          ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0201                   University of Maryland                                    Page 1110
Title           INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH            Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     SURI, MANIL                      Fall   2005                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       39
Questionnaires:   17                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies           Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   1   4   5   4   1  3.00 1628/1674  3.32  4.07  4.27 4.07  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   1   6   6   2  3.44 1527/1674  3.82  4.24  4.23 4.16  3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   0   4   3   8  4.27  836/1423  4.51  4.38  4.27 4.16  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   1   2   3   3   3   3  3.14 1541/1609  3.30  4.12  4.22 4.05  3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   3   1   1   5   3   2  3.33 1329/1585  3.61  3.88  3.96 3.88  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  3   1   2   4   3   2  3.25 1386/1535  2.96  4.17  4.08 3.89  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   1   3   5   6  4.07 1057/1651  4.42  4.42  4.18 4.10  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87  778/1673  4.81  4.74  4.69 4.67  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   1   6   5   2  3.57 1344/1656  3.57  4.00  4.07 3.96  3.57

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1   0   1   5   8  4.27 1136/1586  4.33  4.45  4.43 4.37  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   1   2  11  4.71 1002/1585  4.66  4.69  4.69 4.60  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   2   6   7  4.19 1007/1582  3.97  4.13  4.26 4.17  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   2   3   4   5  3.86 1240/1575  3.93  4.23  4.27 4.17  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2   3   2   1   2   5  3.31 1142/1380  3.24  3.51  3.94 3.78  3.31

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   2   2   5   4   2  3.13 1324/1520  3.24  3.52  4.01 3.76  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   1   5   4   4  3.79 1191/1515  3.66  3.76  4.24 3.97  3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   1   4   3   7  4.07 1030/1511  3.67  3.71  4.27 4.00  4.07
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   8   1   2   3   1   0  2.57  959/ 994  2.57  3.77  3.94 3.73  2.57

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12   1   1   0   2   0   1  3.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0   1   1   2   1   2  3.29  254/ 278  3.29  3.15  4.19 3.97  3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0   0   1   2   1   1  3.40  250/ 260  3.40  3.40  4.46 4.41  3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12   0   1   0   3   0   1  3.00  251/ 259  3.00  3.65  4.33 4.19  3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13   1   0   0   3   0   0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20 4.00  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31 3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39 4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14 3.69  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       15   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.30  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15   0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15   0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 3.88  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1111
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC         Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  WOODS, DELENA                Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     61
Questionnaires: 43                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	10	11	7	10	5	2.74	1651/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	2.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	10	7	18	3.77	1364/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	8	22	4.07	980/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	31	5	0	3	1	3	2.75	1592/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	2	6	9	13	4.10	702/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1066/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	8	10	22	4.19	945/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	1	2	5	23	10	3.95	1595/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	7	3	12	11	3	3.00	1540/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	6	11	6	12	3.41	1497/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	6	12	18	4.13	1448/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	5	9	7	16	3.77	1296/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	4	7	2	7	8	11	3.40	1402/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	27	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1190/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	9	4	5	1	5	2.54	1468/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	6	3	6	3	6	3.00	1420/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	5	9	2	5	3.04	1414/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	19	19	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 994	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0101                    University of Maryland                        Page 1111
Title         ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC               Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   WOODS, DELENA                        Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     61
Questionnaires:  43                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    8        0.00-0.99    2        A    8        Required for Majors  16      Graduate     0        Major        0
28-55    0        1.00-1.99    0        B   15
56-83    0        2.00-2.99    1        C    6        General               1      Under-grad  43        Non-major   43
84-150   1        3.00-3.49    1        D    1
Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    1        F    1        Electives             4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                15
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0201            University of Maryland                                    Page 1112
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC         Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    WOODS, DELENA              Fall   2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      58
Questionnaires:  43                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       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  10   8  12   7   6  2.79 1647/1674  3.45  4.07  4.27  4.07  2.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   7   9   9  17  3.79 1346/1674  4.18  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   3   1   9  10  20  4.00 1016/1423  4.35  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  25   5   0   4   3   6  3.28 1513/1609  3.89  4.12  4.22  4.05  3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  18   2   0   7   7   9  3.84  966/1585  3.91  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 31  1   2   2   3   4  3.58 1251/1535  3.81  4.17  4.08  3.89  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   2   7  11  21  4.09 1037/1651  4.34  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   1   0   1  30  10  4.14 1497/1673  4.48  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  2   5   9  19   2  3.38 1431/1656  3.73  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.38

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   4   4  10   8  17  3.70 1433/1586  4.21  4.45  4.43  4.37  3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   1   3   9   7  23  4.12 1451/1585  4.49  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   3   4  10   5  20  3.83 1255/1582  4.20  4.13  4.26  4.17  3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   2   5   1  10   6  18  3.78 1279/1575  4.14  4.23  4.27  4.17  3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 26  3   2   5   2   3  3.00 1217/1380  3.52  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0   8   2   8   5   9  3.16 1318/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0   3   6   4  10   9  3.50 1303/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  7   2   7   4  10  3.27 1368/1511  3.59  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.27
4. Were special techniques successful                  13  22   2   1   3   0   2  2.88 ****/ 994  4.75  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26  15   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0   4   1   3   0   4  2.92  265/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  2.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 12  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           31  11   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31  10   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20  4.00  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 33  8   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 33 9   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33  9   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    33   8   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                33   8   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35   0   2   0   5   0   1  2.75 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  35  0   1   0   5   0   2  3.25 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       34   6   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   34   6   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 34   8   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.30  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33  0   1   1   3   3   2  3.40 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    34   1   0   0   1   2   5  4.50 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      34   6   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       34   6   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     34   7   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

Title   ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC   Baltimore County   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: WOODS, DELENA   Fall   2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 43   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   7   0.00-0.99   1   A   7   Required for Majors 14   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   16
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   0   C   8   General   1   Under-grad 43   Non-major   43
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   3   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   12
                                          ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0301            University of Maryland                          Page 1113
Title     ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  WOODS, DELENA                     Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   56
Questionnaires:  25                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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   7  3  6  3  5  2.83 1646/1674  3.45  4.07  4.27  4.07  2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   3  2  3  5 11  3.79 1346/1674  4.18  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   0  3  4  6 11  4.04  992/1423  4.35  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  20   0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/1609  3.89  4.12  4.22  4.05  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   1  0  6  5  4  3.69 1107/1585  3.91  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 19  0  0  3  0  3  4.00 ****/1535  3.81  4.17  4.08  3.89  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  3  3  4 15  4.24  889/1651  4.34  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1   0  0  0 16  8  4.33 1361/1673  4.48  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  4  2  8  9  1  3.04 1534/1656  3.73  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.04

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0  4  5  9  6  3.71 1430/1586  4.21  4.45  4.43  4.37  3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   1  1  5  2 15  4.21 1420/1585  4.49  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  3  2  3  6 10  3.75 1302/1582  4.20  4.13  4.26  4.17  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1   5  1  6  5  6  3.26 1442/1575  4.14  4.23  4.27  4.17  3.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 17  1  0  3  3  0  3.14 1196/1380  3.52  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.14

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  5  5  2  1  1  2.14 1501/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  4  0  3  3  4  3.21 1390/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  3  3  1  5  3  3.13 1398/1511  3.59  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.13
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  13  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 994  4.75  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    11      0.00-0.99    1       A   11        Required for Majors  10    Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0       B    6                                                       
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0       C    6        General               2    Under-grad   25      Non-major   25
  84-150    0      3.00-3.49    1       D    0                                                        
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    0       F    1        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                11
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0401            University of Maryland                          Page 1114
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RILEY, SAMANTHA              Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      59
Questionnaires: 26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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   3   5   8   5   5  3.15 1605/1674  3.45 4.07  4.27 4.07  3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   6  19  4.69  338/1674  4.18 4.24  4.23 4.16  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   1   4  20  4.76  250/1423  4.35 4.38  4.27 4.16  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  15   1   0   0   4   6  4.27  825/1609  3.89 4.12  4.22 4.05  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  14   0   1   2   3   3  3.89  926/1585  3.91 3.88  3.96 3.88  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 19   0   0   0   2   3  4.60 ****/1535  3.81 4.17  4.08 3.89  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   1   0   1   0   7  15  4.57  445/1651  4.34 4.42  4.18 4.10  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0  17   6  4.26 1412/1673  4.48 4.74  4.69 4.67  4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0   0   2   4  11   2  3.68 1286/1656  3.73 4.00  4.07 3.96  3.68


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   1   2   7  14  4.42  989/1586  4.21 4.45  4.43 4.37  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   1   0   6  17  4.63 1118/1585  4.49 4.69  4.69 4.60  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   1   1   3  19  4.67  438/1582  4.20 4.13  4.26 4.17  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   4   0   2   0   1  17  4.65  509/1575  4.14 4.23  4.27 4.17  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 15   1   0   0   2   5  4.25  489/1380  3.52 3.51  3.94 3.78  4.25


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   5   0   1   3   8  3.53 1161/1520  3.38 3.52  4.01 3.76  3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   2   0   4   4   7  3.82 1171/1515  3.84 3.76  4.24 3.97  3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0   3   0   3   4   7  3.71 1249/1511  3.59 3.71  4.27 4.00  3.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  13   0   1   0   1   3  4.20 ****/ 994  4.75 3.77  3.94 3.73  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 265  **** 3.52  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0   2   0   0   0   1  2.33 ****/ 278  2.92 3.15  4.19 3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 260  **** 3.40  4.46 4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 259  **** 3.65  4.33 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 233  **** ****  4.20 4.00  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 103  **** ****  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 101  **** ****  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  95  **** ****  4.31 3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  99  **** ****  4.39 4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  97  **** ****  4.14 3.69  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  76  **** 3.10  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  77  **** 3.20  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  **** ****  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  49  **** ****  4.27 4.30  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  61  **** 4.09  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  **** 4.67  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50  **** 4.33  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  **** 4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.34 3.88  ****
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    6           0.00-0.99    2       A    9         Required for Majors  15      Graduate     0          Major       0
 28-55    0           1.00-1.99    0       B    9
 56-83    0           2.00-2.99    1       C    3         General              0       Under-grad  26          Non-major  26
 84-150   0           3.00-3.49    0       D    1
 Grad.    0           3.50-4.00    0       F    0         Electives            1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                8
                                           ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0501            University of Maryland                              Page 1115
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC         Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID                  Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    57
Questionnaires: 20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  3  8  6  2  3.25 1583/1674  3.45  4.07  4.27  4.07  3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  7  6  6  3.80 1340/1674  4.18  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  8  9  4.25  845/1423  4.35  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   9  1  1  1  2  6  4.00 1094/1609  3.89  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7  1  0  2  5  5  4.00  769/1585  3.91  3.88  3.96  3.88  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  1  0  1  3  5  4.10  828/1535  3.81  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  2  2  9  6  3.85 1258/1651  4.34  4.42  4.18  4.10  3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0 14  5  4.26 1412/1673  4.48  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0  1  6  4  4  3.73 1252/1656  3.73  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.73


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  1  3  7  5  4.00 1300/1586  4.21  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  1  0  6  9  4.44 1283/1585  4.49  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  0  3  9  4  4.06 1099/1582  4.20  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  1  1  9  4  4.07 1115/1575  4.14  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  7  1  1  1  3  1  3.29 1149/1380  3.52  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.29


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  2  0  2  5  2  3.45 1195/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  1  0  3  3  3  3.70 1239/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  1  0  2  5  2  3.70 1249/1511  3.59  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.70
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  8  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 994  4.75  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   18  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      8      0.00-0.99   1      A    6      Required for Majors  7    Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B   10
56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1      C    0      General              2    Under-grad  20      Non-major  20
84-150     2      3.00-3.49   3      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3      F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                              responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               6
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0601              University of Maryland                        Page 1116
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL               Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires:  25                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 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  1  5  5 12  3.96 1246/1674  3.45  4.07  4.27  4.07  3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  3  4  9  9  3.96 1196/1674  4.18  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  7  3 13  4.08  968/1423  4.35  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0 16  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  892/1609  3.89  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9  3  1  3  4  5  3.44 1274/1585  3.91  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17  3  0  1  3  1  2.88 1475/1535  3.81  4.17  4.08  3.89  2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  3  5  1 16  4.20  934/1651  4.34  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  2 23  4.92  565/1673  4.48  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  2  6 11  2  3.62 1324/1656  3.73  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.62


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  1  4  4 13  4.32 1094/1586  4.21  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  1  1 10 11  4.35 1348/1585  4.49  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  4  2  6 10  4.00 1129/1582  4.20  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  1  2  3  8  8  3.91 1216/1575  4.14  4.23  4.27  4.17  3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 16  2  1  1  3  0  2.71 1298/1380  3.52  3.51  3.94  3.78  2.71


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  3  2  3  4  3  3.13 1324/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  2  1  1  5  6  3.80 1180/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  2  4  3  0  3  2.83 1457/1511  3.59  3.71  4.27  4.00  2.83
4. Were special techniques successful                  10 13  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/ 994  4.75  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     24  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      7      0.00-0.99    2      A    6    Required for Majors  10   Graduate      0    Major         0
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    3
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C    6    General               1   Under-grad   25    Non-major    25
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    2      D    2
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1      F    0    Electives             2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                             responses to be significant
                                       I    0    Other                 5
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0701              University of Maryland                              Page 1117
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC            Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL               Fall  2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    58
Questionnaires:  36                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	12	8	13	3.86	1353/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	6	21	4.31	856/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	6	24	4.43	672/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	996/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	3	0	6	4	5	3.44	1267/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1207/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	3	6	21	4.29	820/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	212/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	0	5	11	9	3.93	1090/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	7	26	4.68	648/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	1024/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	4	9	18	4.15	1043/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	5	24	4.47	730/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	992/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	948/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	898/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	1194/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	22	12	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****

```
                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      10      0.00-0.99   1       A   13      Required for Majors  16      Graduate      0        Major        0
28-55       1      1.00-1.99   0       B   10
56-83       0      2.00-2.99   0       C    4      General               1      Under-grad   36        Non-major   36
84-150      2      3.00-3.49   3       D    1
Grad.       0      3.50-4.00   2       F    1      Electives             4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other              7
?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0801              University of Maryland                                    Page 1118
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    STARK, BETSY                 Fall   2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     57
Questionnaires:  32                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	20	4.50	607/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	27	4.77	248/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	226/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	1	5	1	6	3.71	1348/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	352/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	578/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	28	4.84	157/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	972/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	331/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	266/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	208/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	171/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	290/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	546/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	620/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	4	18	4.38	769/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	20	1	3	0	0	2	2.83	****/ 994	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0801          University of Maryland                    Page 1118
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                      JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    STARK, BETSY                   Fall   2005                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    57
Questionnaires: 32                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27   12         0.00-0.99   3        A   15        Required for Majors  17    Graduate    0        Major       0
 28-55    2         1.00-1.99   0        B    7
 56-83    1         2.00-2.99   3        C    7        General               0    Under-grad  32       Non-major  32
 84-150   0         3.00-3.49   2        D    1
 Grad.    0         3.50-4.00   2        F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                13
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0901              University of Maryland                          Page 1119
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC            Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   STARK, BETSY                   Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    53
Questionnaires:  29                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  2  6  7 13  4.00 1196/1674  3.45  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  5 22  4.69  352/1674  4.18  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  1 25  4.76  262/1423  4.35  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  0  1  3 17  4.76  212/1609  3.89  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  2  1  8 12  4.30  512/1585  3.91  3.88  3.96  3.88  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 0 3 4 7  4.29  631/1535  3.81  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  5 23  4.76  231/1651  4.34  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  8 21  4.72 1001/1673  4.48  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2 0 0 2 3 12  4.59  324/1656  3.73  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.59


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  1  0  0  3 24  4.75  496/1586  4.21  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  1  0  0  1 26  4.82  762/1585  4.49  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  1  0  3 22  4.77  299/1582  4.20  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  0  1 25  4.85  225/1575  4.14  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 15 1 1 1 2 6  4.00  666/1380  3.52  3.51  3.94  3.78  4.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 2 2 1 1 16  4.23  673/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 3 18  4.77  360/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24  3.97  4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 2 1 0 2 17 4.41  751/1511  3.59  3.71  4.27  4.00  4.41
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  13  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  115/ 994  4.75  3.77  3.94  3.73  4.75


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 1 1 0 0 1 2.67 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26  2  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.33  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   28 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    28 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      7     0.00-0.99   0      A   14    Required for Majors  8   Graduate      0     Major        0
  28-55      2     1.00-1.99   0      B    3
  56-83      0     2.00-2.99   1      C    5    General              2   Under-grad   29     Non-major   29
  84-150     2     3.00-3.49   2      D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00   1      F    0    Electives            4   #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                            responses to be significant
                                      I    0    Other                9
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 115  0201          University of Maryland                    Page 1120
Title        FINITE MATHEMATICS          Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   LO, JAMES T                 Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires: 23                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions              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  5  6  8  2  2  2.57 1663/1674  2.57  4.07  4.27  4.07  2.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  4  9  5  3  3.13 1594/1674  3.13  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  5  1  1  8  8  3.57 1256/1423  3.57  4.38  4.27  4.16  3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   9  2  1  2  6  3  3.50 1452/1609  3.50  4.12  4.22  4.05  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3  3  0  3  6  7  3.74 1066/1585  3.74  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 8 2 2 4 3 2 3.08 1430/1535 3.08 4.17 4.08 3.89 3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  3  0  4  4 11  3.91 1228/1651  3.91  4.42  4.18  4.10  3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  1  0  0  0 21  4.82  868/1673  4.82  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 1 2 8 4 0 3.00 1540/1656 3.00 4.00 4.07 3.96 3.00


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0  1  6  6  5  2  3.05 1535/1586  3.05  4.45  4.43  4.37  3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  1  1  4 15  4.57 1166/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 3 5 7 2 2 2.74 1550/1582 2.74 4.13 4.26 4.17 2.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  4  2  6  5  3  3.05 1480/1575  3.05  4.23  4.27  4.17  3.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 17 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 ****/1380 **** 3.51 3.94 3.78 ****


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 5 2 8 1 2 2.61 1463/1520 2.61 3.52 4.01 3.76 2.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 4 4 2 5 4 3.05 1417/1515 3.05 3.76 4.24 3.97 3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 5 9 4 3.94 1103/1511 3.94 3.71 4.27 4.00 3.94
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  17  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 3.97 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 2 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 260 **** 3.40 4.46 4.41 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          20  2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.20 4.00 ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 1 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 103 **** **** 4.41 4.33 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 1 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.48 4.18 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 2 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 95 **** **** 4.31 3.99 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               20  1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.32 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 3.42 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      20  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  20  1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20 0 1 1 0 0 1 2.67 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.30 ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 1 0 0 1 2.67 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 3.87 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   20  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     20  1  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    20  2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 115  0201                University of Maryland                    Page 1120
Title          FINITE MATHEMATICS              Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    LO, JAMES T                     Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 23                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4        0.00-0.99    2        A    4        Required for Majors  11        Graduate    0        Major       0
28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0        B    7
56-83      4        2.00-2.99    3        C   10        General              0        Under-grad  23        Non-major   23
84-150     5        3.00-3.49    5        D    1
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    1        F    0        Electives            0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               13
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 131  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1121
Title         MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I        Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   TIGHE, BONNY                 Fall  2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      34
Questionnaires: 24                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   6  16  4.54  558/1674  4.54  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.54
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3  21  4.88  161/1674  4.88  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.88
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   1  23  4.96   66/1423  4.96  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.96
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  15   0   0   1   1   7  4.67  312/1609  4.67  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.67
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   1   1   1   6   8  4.12  692/1585  4.12  3.88  3.96  3.88  4.12
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10   0   2   1   1  10  4.36  558/1535  4.36  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.36
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   2  21  4.91  104/1651  4.91  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.91
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   3  20  4.87  778/1673  4.87  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.87
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   1   7  12  4.55  345/1656  4.55  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.55


             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   5  17  4.77  453/1586  4.77  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.77
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.60  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   1   0   1   6  14  4.45  704/1582  4.45  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.45
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   0   0   3  19  4.70  453/1575  4.70  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.70
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 19  1   0   0   0   3  4.00 ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94  3.78  ****


             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  162/1520  4.86  3.52  4.01  3.76  4.86
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57  568/1515  4.57  3.76  4.24  3.97  4.57
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0   0   0   1   0   6  4.71  458/1511  4.71  3.71  4.27  4.00  4.71
 4. Were special techniques successful                  17   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  178/ 994  4.57  3.77  3.94  3.73  4.57


             Laboratory
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2          0.00-0.99    1      A   16         Required for Majors   6     Graduate     0        Major        0
 28-55      7          1.00-1.99    0      B    4
 56-83      3          2.00-2.99    0      C    3         General               2     Under-grad  24        Non-major   24
 84-150     3          3.00-3.49    7      D    0
 Grad.      0          3.50-4.00    6      F    0         Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                14
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1122
Title       PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC          Baltimore County                                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL              Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    160
Questionnaires: 86                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                  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   2   4  15  27  37  4.09 1123/1674  3.87  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   1   3  13  22  46  4.28  894/1674  3.91  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   1  10  19  55  4.51  575/1423  3.95  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  32   1   5  12  12  23  3.96 1146/1609  3.63  4.12  4.22  4.05  3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  30   0   6  11  23  14  3.83  976/1585  3.57  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  48  2   2   8  13  10  3.77 1132/1535  3.60  4.17  4.08  3.89  3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0   0   3   4  19  57  4.57  445/1651  4.30  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0   0   0   0   2  80  4.98  212/1673  4.64  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 20  1  1   2  11  27  24  4.09  900/1656  3.69  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.09


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   1   2   6  16  59  4.55  816/1586  4.29  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   1   3   9  70  4.78  853/1585  4.50  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   1   3  14  22  44  4.25  935/1582  3.81  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   2   1   6  23  52  4.45  755/1575  3.96  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  38   6   3   4  10  21  3.84  838/1380  3.59  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.84


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  14   3  18  22  23  3.46 1189/1520  3.47  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   7  11  15  14  33  3.69 1246/1515  3.55  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0   7   5  17  22  27  3.73 1232/1511  3.59  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   8  59   2   2   8   5   2  3.16 ****/ 994  3.27  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  54  16   3   3   4   4   2  2.94 ****/ 265  3.67  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 64  0   1   2   4   5  10  3.95  198/ 278  3.77  3.15  4.19  3.97  3.95
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 65 10   0   0   3   3   5  4.18 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           67   5   1   2   1   6   4  3.71 ****/ 259  4.29  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 67  11   0   0   2   2   4  4.25 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20  4.00  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 66  9   0   1   1   4   5  4.18 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 71  8   0   0   2   2   3  4.14 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 71  8   0   0   1   3   3  4.29 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    71   4   1   1   3   3   3  3.55 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                71   5   0   1   2   3   4  4.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 73   0   3   1   1   5   3  3.31 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 74   0   2   1   3   3   3  3.33 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       74   2   0   1   1   4   4  4.10 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   74   4   0   0   1   4   3  4.25 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 73   6   0   0   1   3   3  4.29 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.30  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 71  0   1   1   4   4   5  3.73 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    71   1   0   0   3   5   6  4.21 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      71   2   0   0   5   4   4  3.92 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       71   2   0   0   2   6   5  4.23 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     71   2   2   0   2   4   5  3.77 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

Title   PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL   Fall   2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 160
Questionnaires: 86   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   20   0.00-0.99   6   A   26   Required for Majors 20   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   6   1.00-1.99   0   B   29
 56-83   2   2.00-2.99   2   C   16   General   1   Under-grad 86   Non-major   86
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   49
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201          University of Maryland                        Page 1123
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC        Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI              Fall  2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    121
Questionnaires: 59                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	10	27	22	4.20	1017/1674	3.87	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	23	29	4.37	776/1674	3.91	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	17	36	4.51	575/1423	3.95	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	38	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1254/1609	3.63	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	3	3	9	17	10	3.67	1121/1585	3.57	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	36	3	1	6	6	6	3.50	1295/1535	3.60	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	17	38	4.58	432/1651	4.30	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	52	5	4.07	1541/1673	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	6	22	23	4.33	615/1656	3.69	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.33
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	15	40	4.67	663/1586	4.29	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	17	38	4.63	1106/1585	4.50	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	19	34	4.53	610/1582	3.81	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	40	4.61	565/1575	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	38	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	666/1380	3.59	3.51	3.94	3.78	4.00
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	5	12	9	16	3.45	1200/1520	3.47	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	4	16	15	10	3.47	1318/1515	3.55	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	3	12	13	16	3.65	1270/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	11	38	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	****/ 994	3.27	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	10	1	3	4	3	7	3.67	222/ 265	3.67	3.52	4.23	3.97	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	4	0	5	8	7	3.58	234/ 278	3.77	3.15	4.19	3.97	3.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	9	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	4	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	150/ 259	4.29	3.65	4.33	4.19	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	10	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	4	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	7	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	5	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	6	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	3	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201                    University of Maryland                            Page 1123
Title         PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC                Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                       Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   121
Questionnaires: 59                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned              Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    16            0.00-0.99   3        A   24         Required for Majors  16     Graduate     0        Major        1
 28-55    11            1.00-1.99   0        B   22
 56-83     5            2.00-2.99   9        C    8         General               0     Under-grad  59        Non-major   58
 84-150    2            3.00-3.49   9        D    1
 Grad.     0            3.50-4.00   3        F    0         Electives             3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                             I    0         Other               36
                                             ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0301            University of Maryland                          Page 1124
Title     PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   WILSON, MARY C              Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   156
Questionnaires: 60                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 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   7   8  17  16  12  3.30 1572/1674  3.87  4.07  4.27  4.07  3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  12   7  16  15  10  3.07 1602/1674  3.91  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1  16   8  13  13   9  2.85 1393/1423  3.95  4.38  4.27  4.16  2.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  20   4   7  13  14   2  3.08 1552/1609  3.63  4.12  4.22  4.05  3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  23   7   2  12   8   8  3.22 1380/1585  3.57  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 31   1   6   7   7   8  3.52 1289/1535  3.60  4.17  4.08  3.89  3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   2   3   7  11  17  20  3.76 1324/1651  4.30  4.42  4.18  4.10  3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   8  51  4.86  778/1673  4.64  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1 10   9  17   7   3  2.65 1611/1656  3.69  4.00  4.07  3.96  2.65


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   5   5  16  14  20  3.65 1445/1586  4.29  4.45  4.43  4.37  3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   2   3  11  15  29  4.10 1455/1585  4.50  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  15  14  12  10   7  2.66 1558/1582  3.81  4.13  4.26  4.17  2.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  16  11  13   8  12  2.82 1526/1575  3.96  4.23  4.27  4.17  2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 21   8   9   8   4   9  2.92 1259/1380  3.59  3.51  3.94  3.78  2.92


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   7   4  17  11  18  3.51 1169/1520  3.47  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.51
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   7   4  17  11  17  3.48 1310/1515  3.55  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0   8   4  19   8  17  3.39 1335/1511  3.59  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.39
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  23   6   3   8   8   8  3.27  830/ 994  3.27  3.77  3.94  3.73  3.27

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 59   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 265  3.67  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                      Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    18       0.00-0.99    3        A   15          Required for Majors   7      Graduate      0        Major         0
  28-55     2       1.00-1.99    1        B    9
  56-83     3       2.00-2.99    3        C   14          General               1      Under-grad   60        Non-major    60
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49    2        D    6
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    4        F    1          Electives             5      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                          I    0          Other                37
                                          ?    4
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1125
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                 Fall   2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      65
Questionnaires: 40                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  2 10 16 12  3.95 1259/1674  3.85  4.07  4.27 4.07  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  4 18 18  4.35  803/1674  4.07  4.24  4.23 4.16  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  2 11 27  4.63  431/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27 4.16  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  17  0  3  7  5  8  3.78 1299/1609  4.07  4.12  4.22 4.05  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 19 0 3  7  6  5  3.62 1156/1585  3.67  3.88  3.96 3.88  3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15 3 3 4 9 6  3.48 1302/1535  4.10  4.17  4.08 3.89  3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  1 10 28  4.63  372/1651  4.46  4.42  4.18 4.10  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1  0  1  0  0 37  4.92  565/1673  4.66  4.74  4.69 4.67  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 5 18 16 4.28 680/1656  3.87  4.00  4.07 3.96  4.28


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  3 10 26  4.59  774/1586  4.42  4.45  4.43 4.37  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0 15 23  4.61 1142/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69 4.60  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 4 9 26   4.56  567/1582  3.98  4.13  4.26 4.17  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  1  4  8 27  4.53  669/1575  4.06  4.23  4.27 4.17  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 30 1 1 2 1 5   3.80  866/1380  3.53  3.51  3.94 3.78  3.80


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 11 4 12 5 4  2.64 1459/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01 3.76  2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 5 3 14 8 6  3.19 1395/1515  3.39  3.76  4.24 3.97  3.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 3 6 11 6 9 3.34 1348/1511  3.44  3.71  4.27 4.00  3.34
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  30  1  1  1  2  1  3.17 ****/ 994  3.70  3.77  3.94 3.73  ****


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24  10  0  3  2  1  0  2.67 ****/ 265  3.44  3.52  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 5 0 3 1 2  2.55  275/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19 3.97  2.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 9 0 0 1 1 0  3.50 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46 4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          28   6  0  0  2  2  2  4.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29  9  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20 4.00  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 32 6 0 0 0 1 1  4.50 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 33 6 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33 6 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31 3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   33   5  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39 4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               33   5  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14 3.69  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 3 0 0 2 2  3.00 ****/  76  3.10  3.10  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 34 0 2 1 0 1 2  3.00 ****/  77  3.20  3.20  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      34   3  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  34   3  2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 34  4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.30  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 0 1 1 3  3.83 ****/  61  4.09  4.09  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   34   1  0  0  1  1  3  4.40 ****/  52  4.67  4.67  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     34   1  1  1  0  1  2  3.40 ****/  50  4.33  4.33  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      34   4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    34   4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 3.88  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	4	A	22	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1126
Title           CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I     Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     TIGHE, BONNY               Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     54
Questionnaires: 32                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  1  0  0 12 19 4.50  607/1674 3.85  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  1  0  0  5 26 4.72  314/1674 4.07  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  5 25 4.72  310/1423 4.21  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0 12  0  1  2  6 11 4.35  715/1609 4.07  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  3  1  5  3 12 3.83  976/1585 3.67  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 17 0  0  1  4  9 4.57  310/1535 4.10  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  2 10 20 4.56  445/1651 4.46  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  1  0  0  0  6 25 4.81  887/1673 4.66  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  6 23 4.73  200/1656 3.87  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.73

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  1  3 28 4.84  319/1586 4.42  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  3 29 4.91  567/1585 4.57  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  6 25 4.75  313/1582 3.98  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  4 28 4.88  203/1575 4.06  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23  1  1  1  0  6 4.00  666/1380 3.53  3.51  3.94  3.78  4.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  3  0  2 10 15 4.13  751/1520 3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  2  3  6  2 17 3.97 1069/1515 3.39  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  3  0  6  6 14 3.97 1085/1511 3.44  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.97
4. Were special techniques successful                   2 20  1  0  4  1  4 3.70  662/ 994 3.70  3.77  3.94  3.73  3.70

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  30  0  0  1  0  1  0 3.00 ****/ 265 3.44  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 0  0  0  2  0 4.00 ****/ 278 2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 0 0  1  1  0  0 2.50 ****/ 260 **** 3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           31  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65  4.33  4.19  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades      Reasons            Type            Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3      0.00-0.99    0     A   10    Required for Majors   2     Graduate     0     Major        1
 28-55     9      1.00-1.99    0     B   12
 56-83     1      2.00-2.99    4     C    6    General               0     Under-grad  32     Non-major   31
 84-150    3      3.00-3.49    6     D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3     F    0    Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                               responses to be significant
                                     I    0    Other                27
                                     ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1127
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I     Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    SLOWIKOWSKI, WI            Fall  2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    52
Questionnaires: 29                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  2  1 10 15  4.24  966/1674  3.85  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  6 20  4.59  483/1674  4.07  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  3  8 18  4.52  563/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   7  0  2  3  5 12  4.23  892/1609  4.07  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 11  1  2  4  2  8  3.82  986/1585  3.67  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11  0  0  2  7  9  4.39  528/1535  4.10  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  4 24  4.79  186/1651  4.46  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0 25  4  4.14 1504/1673  4.66  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  1 12 12  4.44  465/1656  3.87  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.44

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  2  5 21  4.68  648/1586  4.42  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  1  6 21  4.71 1002/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  4  6 18  4.50  632/1582  3.98  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  8 20  4.71  423/1575  4.06  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 17  1  3  2  2  3  3.27 1152/1380  3.53  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.27

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  5  1 10  4  4  3.04 1345/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  6  2  6  5  7  3.19 1395/1515  3.39  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  5  1 10  3  7  3.23 1375/1511  3.44  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.23
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  20  0  0  4  0  1  3.40 ****/ 994  3.70  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 23  1  5  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 265  3.44  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 1  1  1  3  4.00 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 2 0 1  0  1  2  4.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          23  1  2  1  1  0  1  2.40 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  76  3.10  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  77  3.20  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  61  4.09  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   28  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  4.67  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     28  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  4.33  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      28  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    28  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    6       0.00-0.99    0      A   14      Required for Majors   1    Graduate     0      Major      0
 28-55    9       1.00-1.99    0      B    7
 56-83    2       2.00-2.99    6      C    8      General               0    Under-grad  29      Non-major 29
 84-150   3       3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    6      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                27
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0401           University of Maryland                              Page 1128
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MANUKYAN, ZORAY                  Fall  2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     67
Questionnaires: 21                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  4  4  5  7  3.62 1474/1674  3.85  4.07  4.27  4.07  3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  1  2  8  5  5  3.52 1489/1674  4.07  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  4  4  3  9  3.71 1188/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27  4.16  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  10  0  1  1  4  5  4.18  941/1609  4.07  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  10  1  2  1  4  3  3.55 1199/1585  3.67  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  9  1  0  0  5  6  4.25  667/1535  4.10  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  0  5  6  9  4.05 1070/1651  4.46  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 21  5.00    1/1673  4.66  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  2  2  7  4  1  3.00 1540/1656  3.87  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  4  4  4  9  3.86 1385/1586  4.42  4.45  4.43  4.37  3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  2  2  2 15  4.43 1292/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  2  4  6  6  3  3.19 1481/1582  3.98  4.13  4.26  4.17  3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  1  4  3  7  6  3.62 1346/1575  4.06  4.23  4.27  4.17  3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 20  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1380  3.53  3.51  3.94  3.78  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  2  4  5  5  3.65 1104/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  1  0  8  3  5  3.65 1260/1515  3.39  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  2  2  5  5  3  3.29 1361/1511  3.44  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.29
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  16  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 994  3.70  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  3.44  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19  0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          20   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     8       0.00-0.99    2       A    2        Required for Majors  4      Graduate     0      Major        2
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    6
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99    0       C    6        General              0      Under-grad  21      Non-major   19
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49    0       D    1
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    0       F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               15
                                         ?    5
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0501           University of Maryland                              Page 1129
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I       Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J    (Instr. A)        Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     55
Questionnaires: 36                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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   3  1  3 13 16  4.06 1155/1674  3.85  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  3 19 14  4.31  870/1674  4.07  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  3  9 24  4.58  482/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  14   0  0  2  8 12  4.45  567/1609  4.07  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  15   2  3  1  6  9  3.81 1006/1585  3.67  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  20  1  0  2  2 11  4.38  538/1535  4.10  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  1  4 31  4.83  157/1651  4.46  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  1 25 10  4.25 1420/1673  4.66  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  3 20 10  4.21  770/1656  3.87  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.27


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  1  3 32  4.86  284/1586  4.42  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  2  6 28  4.72  981/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  1  2 11 22  4.50  632/1582  3.98  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  3  0  7 26  4.56  635/1575  4.06  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  27  1  1  1  3  3  3.67  962/1380  3.53  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0   3  4  6  7 15  3.77 1010/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0   3  7  6  8 11  3.49 1310/1515  3.39  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  4  3 11  5 12  3.51 1306/1511  3.44  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.51
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  30   1  1  0  0  3  3.60 ****/ 994  3.70  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  10   1  1  2  3  2  3.44  240/ 265  3.44  3.52  4.23  3.97  3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18  0  4  2  4  4  4  3.11  256/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  3.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 15  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19  12   0  0  1  2  2  4.20 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  14   0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20  4.00  ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24  8   0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25  8  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26  8  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26   7   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26   7   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26   0   3  0  2  3  2  3.10   58/  76  3.10  3.10  3.98  3.32  3.10
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26   0   3  0  2  2  3  3.20   58/  77  3.20  3.20  3.93  3.42  3.20
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26   3   0  0  0  2  5  4.71 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26   5   0  0  0  3  2  4.40 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26   7   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.30  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0   1  0  2  2  6  4.09   27/  61  4.09  4.09  4.09  3.87  4.09
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    27   0   0  0  0  3  6  4.67   23/  52  4.67  4.67  4.26  3.91  4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26   1   0  0  1  4  4  4.33   32/  50  4.33  4.33  4.44  4.39  4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26   5   0  0  1  2  2  4.20 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   6   0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0501                    University of Maryland                              Page 1129
Title           CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     SONG, YOON J    (Instr. A)        Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      55
Questionnaires:  36                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA           Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                        Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27   10          0.00-0.99    4        A   12       Required for Majors   4    Graduate      0       Major          2
 28-55    5          1.00-1.99    0        B   12
 56-83    0          2.00-2.99    1        C    6       General               0    Under-grad   36       Non-major     34
 84-150   1          3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.    0          3.50-4.00    0        F    0       Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                27
                                           ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0501          University of Maryland                              Page 1130
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I      Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J   (Instr. B)       Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      55
Questionnaires:  36                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	3	1	3	13	16	4.06	1155/1674	3.85	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	19	14	4.31	870/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	24	4.58	482/1423	4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	567/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	3	1	6	9	3.81	1006/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	538/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	157/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	25	10	4.25	1420/1673	4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	615/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1585	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1582	3.98	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1575	4.06	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	7	15	3.77	1010/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	7	6	8	11	3.49	1310/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	3	11	5	12	3.51	1306/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	1	30	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 994	3.70	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	10	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	240/ 265	3.44	3.52	4.23	3.97	3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	4	2	4	4	4	3.11	256/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	3.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	15	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	12	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	14	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	58/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	3.10
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	58/ 77	3.20	3.20	3.93	3.42	3.20
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	27/ 61	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.87	4.09
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	23/ 52	4.67	4.67	4.26	3.91	4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	32/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.39	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0501            University of Maryland                    Page 1130
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I      Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    SONG, YOON J   (Instr. B)   Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     55
Questionnaires: 36                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    10        0.00-0.99   4        A   12        Required for Majors  4      Graduate     0       Major        2
 28-55     5        1.00-1.99   0        B   12
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1        C    6        General              0      Under-grad  36       Non-major   34
 84-150    1        3.00-3.49   3        D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   0        F    0        Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               27
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0601                University of Maryland                                    Page 1131
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I             Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                    Fall   2005                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     76
Questionnaires: 39                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   7  11   5  15  3.67 1449/1674  3.85  4.07  4.27  4.07  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   9  12  17  4.15 1035/1674  4.07  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   2   2  14  21  4.38  718/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  12   2   0   4  10  11  4.04 1074/1609  4.07  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  17   2   0   5   6   8  3.86  956/1585  3.67  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 16   0   0   4   8  10  4.27  643/1535  4.10  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   1   3   4  30  4.66  340/1651  4.46  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   4  34  4.89  724/1673  4.66  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  3   0   0  10  17   3  3.77 1230/1656  3.87  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.77


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   3   8  28  4.64  693/1586  4.42  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   1   9  29  4.72 1002/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   2   8  14  15  4.08 1094/1582  3.98  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   2   1   2   7   8  19  4.14 1070/1575  4.06  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 25   0   0   7   3   3  3.69  944/1380  3.53  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.69


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   4   2  12   6  12  3.56 1149/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   4   2   9   7  13  3.66 1256/1515  3.39  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   4   0  12   6  13  3.69 1257/1511  3.44  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.69
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  29   1   0   1   2   2  3.67 ****/ 994  3.70  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  35   3   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 265  3.44  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 36  0   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           37   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 36  1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 37 0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 37  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    37   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                37   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 37   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  76  3.10  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 37   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  77  3.20  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       37   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   37   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 37   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.30  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  61  4.09  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    37   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  52  4.67  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      37   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  50  4.33  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       37   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     37   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 39   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   10   0.00-0.99   1   A   17   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   1
 28-55   8   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   0   C   4   General   0   Under-grad 39   Non-major   38
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   1   D   1
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   15   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   33
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0701                University of Maryland                                    Page 1132
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    SURI, MANIL                    Fall   2005                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      61
Questionnaires:  14                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank        Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  0  5  5  3  3.64 1459/1674  3.85  4.07  4.27  4.07  3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  1  4  6  3  3.79 1352/1674  4.07  4.24  4.23  4.16  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  3  3  4  4  3.64 1226/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27  4.16  3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  4  0  1  4  4  1  3.50 1452/1609  4.07  4.12  4.22  4.05  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 1 4 0 1 2  2.88 1495/1585  3.67  3.88  3.96  3.88  2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 1406/1535  4.10  4.17  4.08  3.89  3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  2  0  2  2  8  4.00 1097/1651  4.46  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64 1093/1673  4.66  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 5 5 2 3.75 1237/1656  3.87  4.00  4.07  3.96  3.75

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  3  4  7  4.29 1120/1586  4.42  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  2  4  8  4.43 1292/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 3 5 3  3.57 1381/1582  3.98  4.13  4.26  4.17  3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  1  5  3  3  2  3.00 1487/1575  4.06  4.23  4.27  4.17  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1380  3.53  3.51  3.94  3.78  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 3 4 2 1  2.50 1470/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01  3.76  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 2 2 7 0 3  3.00 1420/1515  3.39  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 4 2 2 4 2 2.86 1454/1511  3.44  3.71  4.27  4.00  2.86
4. Were special techniques successful                 0 11  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 994  3.70  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  3.44  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 1 0 0 2 0 3.00 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  76  3.10  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50 ****/  77  3.20  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  61  4.09  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  4.67  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4      0.00-0.99   0        A    5      Required for Majors  1      Graduate      0      Major       0
28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0        B    8
56-83      0      2.00-2.99   1        C    1      General              0      Under-grad    14     Non-major   14
84-150     0      3.00-3.49   4        D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   0        F    0      Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                13
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0801              University of Maryland                            Page 1133
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  LYNN, YEN-MOW                  Fall   2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      70
Questionnaires: 14                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               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  2  6  3  1 2.93 1640/1674  3.85  4.07  4.27 4.07  2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  4  7  3  0 2.93 1628/1674  4.07  4.24  4.23 4.16  2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1  2  6  4  1 3.14 1349/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27 4.16  3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5   0  1  2  5  1 3.67 1377/1609  4.07  4.12  4.22 4.05  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2   0  1  4  2  4 3.82  996/1585  3.67  3.88  3.96 3.88  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7   0  0  1  4  1 4.00  870/1535  4.10  4.17  4.08 3.89  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   1  1  2  5  4 3.77 1317/1651  4.46  4.42  4.18 4.10  3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  0 13 5.00    1/1673  4.66  4.74  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   2  2  5  0  0 2.33 1631/1656  3.87  4.00  4.07 3.96  2.33

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   1  1  3  6  3 3.64 1448/1586  4.42  4.45  4.43 4.37  3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  1  3  4  6 4.07 1460/1585  4.57  4.69  4.69 4.60  4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   3  1  6  3  0 2.69 1554/1582  3.98  4.13  4.26 4.17  2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0  4  3  5  0 3.08 1476/1575  4.06  4.23  4.27 4.17  3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  8   1  1  0  2  0 2.75 1290/1380  3.53  3.51  3.94 3.78  2.75

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0  2  3  4  1 3.40 1221/1520  3.38  3.52  4.01 3.76  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   1  3  4  0  2 2.90 1445/1515  3.39  3.76  4.24 3.97  2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0  1  4  3  2 3.60 1291/1511  3.44  3.71  4.27 4.00  3.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   8   1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/ 994  3.70  3.77  3.94 3.73  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12   0   1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/ 265  3.44  3.52  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0  0  1  1  0  0 2.50 ****/ 278  2.92  3.15  4.19 3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 1  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46 4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12   0   1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12   1   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20 4.00  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31 3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39 4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14 3.69  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  76  3.10  3.10  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  77  3.20  3.20  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  61  4.09  4.09  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  52  4.67  4.67  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  50  4.33  4.33  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 3.88  ****
```

Title   CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW   Fall   2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 70
Questionnaires: 14   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151H 0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1134
Title      CALC/ANALY GEOM I-HONO          Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RATHINAM, MURUH              Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  0  5  1 3.86 1353/1674  3.86  4.07  4.27 4.07  3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  3  4 4.57  495/1674  4.57  4.24  4.23 4.16  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  2  4 4.43  672/1423  4.43  4.38  4.27 4.16  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0  0  0  5  1 4.17  963/1609  4.17  4.12  4.22 4.05  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  1  4  2 4.14  662/1585  4.14  3.88  3.96 3.88  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  3  3 4.29  631/1535  4.29  4.17  4.08 3.89  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  2  1  4 4.29  832/1651  4.29  4.42  4.18 4.10  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  4  0 3.80 1200/1656  3.80  4.00  4.07 3.96  3.80

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  4  3 4.43  974/1586  4.43  4.45  4.43 4.37  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  1  6 4.86  689/1585  4.86  4.69  4.69 4.60  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  1  4  2 4.14 1043/1582  4.14  4.13  4.26 4.17  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  1  1  5 4.57  612/1575  4.57  4.23  4.27 4.17  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  0  1  2  1  0 3.00 1217/1380  3.00  3.51  3.94 3.78  3.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  1  0  2  2 4.00  810/1520  4.00  3.52  4.01 3.76  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  3  1 4.00 1024/1515  4.00  3.76  4.24 3.97  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  3  2  0 3.40 1333/1511  3.40  3.71  4.27 4.00  3.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3   1  0  1  0  0 2.00  977/ 994  2.00  3.77  3.94 3.73  2.00

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19 3.97  ****

              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31 3.99  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6   0   0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6   0   0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6   0   0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   6   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6   0   0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    6   0   0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      6   0   0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44 4.39  ****

                               Frequency Distribution
```

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

?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1135
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY          Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J                  Fall  2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 24                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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  4  2  5 11  3.79 1389/1674  4.44 4.07  4.27 4.07  3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  1  2  6 14  4.29  882/1674  4.57 4.24  4.23 4.16  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  2  2 11  9  4.13  943/1423  4.58 4.38  4.27 4.16  4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  7  0  2  4  5  6  3.88 1236/1609  4.30 4.12  4.22 4.05  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 0  4  2  3  4  3.54 1205/1585  3.95 3.88  3.96 3.88  3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6 0 2 3 5 7  4.00  870/1535  4.52 4.17  4.08 3.89  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  2  2  6 14  4.33  768/1651  4.60 4.42  4.18 4.10  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  4 19  4.83  850/1673  4.74 4.74  4.69 4.67  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 1 1 2 7 5  3.88 1146/1656  4.42 4.00  4.07 3.96  3.88

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  0  9 13  4.59  763/1586  4.81 4.45  4.43 4.37  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  1  8 13  4.55 1191/1585  4.79 4.69  4.69 4.60  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 0 4 7 11  4.17 1016/1582  4.60 4.13  4.26 4.17  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  1  1  7 14  4.48  730/1575  4.66 4.23  4.27 4.17  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 12 0 3 2 1 4  3.60  998/1380  3.75 3.51  3.94 3.78  3.60

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 8 2 4 3 2  2.42 1478/1520  3.22 3.52  4.01 3.76  2.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 2 5 4 3 5  3.21 1390/1515  3.40 3.76  4.24 3.97  3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 2 5 8 1 3  2.89 1448/1511  3.30 3.71  4.27 4.00  2.89

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  21  2  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 265  **** 3.52  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 1 1 0 0  2.50 ****/ 278  2.71 3.15  4.19 3.97  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 2 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 103  **** ****  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 1 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 101  **** ****  4.48 4.18  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 1 0 0  2.00 ****/  76  **** 3.10  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 2 0 0  3.00 ****/  77  **** 3.20  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      22  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  53  **** ****  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  22  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22 0 0 1 0 1 0  3.00 ****/  49  **** ****  4.27 4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 1 1 0 0  2.50 ****/  61  **** 4.09  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   22  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  52  **** 4.67  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     22  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  50  **** 4.33  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      22  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  35  **** 4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    22  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  31  **** 4.34  3.88  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      6      0.00-0.99   1       A    8       Required for Majors  1      Graduate      0       Major        1
 28-55      6      1.00-1.99   1       B    4
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   0       C    7       General              3      Under-grad   24       Non-major   23
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49   2       D    2
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1       F    0       Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                        responses to be significant
I    0              Other               18
?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1136
Title         CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY          Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   TIGHE, BONNY                   Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       60
Questionnaires:   40                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1 11 28  4.68  393/1674  4.44  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2 10 28  4.65  392/1674  4.57  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  2  8 29  4.69  335/1423  4.58  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  14  0  1  2  7 15  4.44  583/1609  4.30  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 13  0  1  4 11 10  4.15  652/1585  3.95  3.88  3.96  3.88  4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 15 0 0 0 10 14 4.58 301/1535 4.52 4.17 4.08 3.89 4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  1  0  9 29  4.60  393/1651  4.60  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  0  0  0  6 33  4.85  814/1673  4.74  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2 9 26 4.65 274/1656 4.42 4.00 4.07 3.96 4.65


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  9 31  4.78  453/1586  4.81  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  3 37  4.93  453/1585  4.79  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0 14 26  4.65  452/1582  4.60  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  7 32  4.78  327/1575  4.66  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 28 0 0 1 5 5 4.36 406/1380 3.75 3.51 3.94 3.78 4.36


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  4  3  7  7 14  3.69 1080/1520  3.22  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0  1  3 13  7 10  3.65 1260/1515  3.40  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 1 0 5 15 11 4.09 1021/1511 3.30 3.71 4.27 4.00 4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  26  0  0  3  2  3  4.00 ****/ 994  3.78  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 39 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 278 2.71 3.15 4.19 3.97 ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   39   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     39   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      39   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    39   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3       0.00-0.99    0      A   13        Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major        5
  28-55     12       1.00-1.99    0      B   12
  56-83      8       2.00-2.99    7      C    8        General               2    Under-grad   40      Non-major   35
  84-150     0       3.00-3.49    7      D    3
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    8      F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                35
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0301              University of Maryland                            Page 1137
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY   (Instr. A)           Fall  2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     50
Questionnaires: 27                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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  4  4 19  4.56  546/1674  4.44  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1 11 15  4.52  566/1674  4.57  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  6 19  4.59  470/1423  4.58  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7  1  0  4  4 11  4.20  930/1609  4.30  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  2  2  4  4 11  3.87  946/1585  3.95  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13 0 0 0 2 11  4.85  116/1535  4.52  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  1  4 21  4.77  220/1651  4.60  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  3 23  4.81  868/1673  4.74  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 1 5 13  4.63  283/1656  4.42  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  5 20  4.73  538/1586  4.81  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  3 22  4.81  811/1585  4.79  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  4  6 16  4.46  690/1582  4.60  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  2  2  3 19  4.50  692/1575  4.66  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 17 1 1 1 1 5  3.89  810/1380  3.75  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.89


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  3  2  3  7  9  3.71 1068/1520  3.22  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  2  4  3  4 11  3.75 1209/1515  3.40  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 4  3  7  3  7  3.25 1371/1511  3.30  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  15  0  1  3  2  3  3.78  628/ 994  3.78  3.77  3.94  3.73  3.78


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 1 0 1 1  0  2.67 ****/ 278  2.71  3.15  4.19  3.97  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20  4.00  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0301           University of Maryland                           Page 1138
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY        Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY   (Instr. B)          Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      50
Questionnaires:  27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                     Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level Sect
            Questions                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  4  4 19 4.56  546/1674  4.44 4.07 4.27 4.07 4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1 11 15 4.52  566/1674  4.57 4.24 4.23 4.16 4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  1  1  6 19 4.59  470/1423  4.58 4.38 4.27 4.16 4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  7  1  0  4  4 11 4.20  930/1609  4.30 4.12 4.22 4.05 4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  2  2  4  4 11 3.87  946/1585  3.95 3.88 3.96 3.88 3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13  0  0  0  2 11 4.85  116/1535  4.52 4.17 4.08 3.89 4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  0  1  4 21 4.77  220/1651  4.60 4.42 4.18 4.10 4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  1  3 23 4.81  868/1673  4.74 4.74 4.69 4.67 4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 20  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  214/1656  4.42 4.00 4.07 3.96 4.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      19  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  266/1586  4.81 4.45 4.43 4.37 4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 19  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  640/1585  4.79 4.69 4.69 4.60 4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 19  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  180/1582  4.60 4.13 4.26 4.17 4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   19  0  0  0  0  2  6 4.75  359/1575  4.66 4.23 4.27 4.17 4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19  7  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1380  3.75 3.51 3.94 3.78 3.89

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3  0  3  2  3  7  9 3.71 1068/1520  3.22 3.52 4.01 3.76 3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3  0  2  4  3  4 11 3.75 1209/1515  3.40 3.76 4.24 3.97 3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  4  3  7  3  7 3.25 1371/1511  3.30 3.71 4.27 4.00 3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                3 15  0  1  3  2  3 3.78  628/ 994  3.78 3.77 3.94 3.73 3.78

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 23  3  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 265  **** 3.52 4.23 3.97 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24  0  1  0  1  1  0 2.67 ****/ 278  2.71 3.15 4.19 3.97 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         24  1  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 259  **** 3.65 4.33 4.19 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24  2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 233  **** **** 4.20 4.00 ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  76  **** 3.10 3.98 3.32 ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0401            University of Maryland                              Page 1139
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                    Fall  2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     57
Questionnaires:  27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  2  1  4  20  4.56  546/1674  4.44  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  3  23  4.78  248/1674  4.57  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  2  24  4.85  167/1423  4.58  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  1  0  2  17  4.75  222/1609  4.30  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  11  2  0  3  2   8  3.93  865/1585  3.95  3.88  3.96  3.88  3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  11  1  0  1  1  12  4.53  346/1535  4.52  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  1  2  0  1  21  4.56  445/1651  4.60  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  2  9  15  4.50 1203/1673  4.74  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  1  1  1  1 10  11  4.21  783/1656  4.42  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.21

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  26  4.96   86/1586  4.81  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  1  25  4.89  615/1585  4.79  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  1  1  5  20  4.63  496/1582  4.60  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  1  0  2  23  4.67  495/1575  4.66  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0 19  1  2  2  0   3  3.25 1160/1380  3.75  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.25

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2  0  6  3  3  3  10  3.32 1257/1520  3.22  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2  0  2  4  7  2  10  3.56 1285/1515  3.40  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  3  0  4  2  3  2  13  3.75 1221/1511  3.30  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  22  0  0  0  0   3  5.00 ****/ 994  3.78  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19  7  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20  0  4  0  0  0   3  2.71  269/ 278  2.71  3.15  4.19  3.97  2.71

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  3  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  3.69  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  24  0  2  0  0  0   1  2.33 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  24  0  2  0  0  0   1  2.33 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       23  2  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   23  3  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  24  0  2  0  0  0   1  2.33 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    23  1  1  0  0  0   2  3.67 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      23  2  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       23  3  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     23  2  0  1  0  0   1  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2       0.00-0.99   1      A   12      Required for Majors  1     Graduate      0     Major       1
28-55      8       1.00-1.99   0      B    7                                Under-grad   27
56-83      4       2.00-2.99   2      C    5      General              1     Under-grad   27     Non-major  26
84-150     0       3.00-3.49   3      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   3      F    0      Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
```

```
I    0          Other              22
?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0501            University of Maryland                           Page 1140
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KAPOOR, JAGMOHA               Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     56
Questionnaires: 22                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  1  5 15  4.50  607/1674  4.44  4.07  4.27 4.07  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  5 16  4.68  352/1674  4.57  4.24  4.23 4.16  4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  1  0  5 14  4.60  459/1423  4.58  4.38  4.27 4.16  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   8  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  786/1609  4.30  4.12  4.22 4.05  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9  1  0  2  1  9  4.31  512/1585  3.95  3.88  3.96 3.88  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  608/1535  4.52  4.17  4.08 3.89  4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  2  2 17  4.55  471/1651  4.60  4.42  4.18 4.10  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  7 14  4.67 1072/1673  4.74  4.74  4.69 4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0  0  1  6  8  4.47  437/1656  4.42  4.00  4.07 3.96  4.47

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  1 20  4.95  107/1586  4.81  4.45  4.43 4.37  4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  2  2 17  4.71 1002/1585  4.79  4.69  4.69 4.60  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  246/1582  4.60  4.13  4.26 4.17  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  4 17  4.81  279/1575  4.66  4.23  4.27 4.17  4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7  2  1  2  4  5  3.64  974/1380  3.75  3.51  3.94 3.78  3.64

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  9  2  2  2  4  2.47 1473/1520  3.22  3.52  4.01 3.76  2.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  7  3  6  1  3  2.50 1470/1515  3.40  3.76  4.24 3.97  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 9  1  4  2  4  2.55 1474/1511  3.30  3.71  4.27 4.00  2.55
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  18  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 994  3.78  3.77  3.94 3.73  ****

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16  4  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23 3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 2  0  1  0  1  2.50 ****/ 278  2.71  3.15  4.19 3.97  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41 4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 4 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18 3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31 3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39 4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14 3.69  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98 3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93 3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18  2  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18  2  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18  2  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.30  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09 3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19  1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26 3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19  1  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44 4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  4.36  3.92 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  31  ****  4.34  3.88 ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0501             University of Maryland                    Page 1140
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY         Baltimore County                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    KAPOOR, JAGMOHA               Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    56
Questionnaires: 22                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    8        0.00-0.99    1       A    8      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0     Major       1
  28-55    4        1.00-1.99    0       B    8
  56-83    2        2.00-2.99    1       C    3      General               0     Under-grad   22     Non-major  21
  84-150   1        3.00-3.49    2       D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    3       F    1      Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                19
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1141
Title      ELEMENTARY CALCULUS                 Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                    Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    140
Questionnaires:  24                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   3  11  10   4.29   903/1674  4.26  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   8  14   4.50   578/1674  4.40  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   6  15   4.46   636/1423  4.38  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  11   0   0   1   5   7   4.46   552/1609  4.28  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6   0   0   2   6  10   4.44   378/1585  4.29  3.88  3.96  3.88  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  8   0   0   3   6   6   4.20   737/1535  4.24  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   1   5  18   4.71   288/1651  4.65  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   2  19   3   4.04  1549/1673  4.44  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0   1   0   2   8   9   4.20   794/1656  4.17  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.20


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   2   3  19   4.71   603/1586  4.56  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   1   0   4  19   4.71  1024/1585  4.77  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   2   0   8  14   4.42   762/1582  4.38  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   1   0   0   7  16   4.54   646/1575  4.60  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 14   1   1   1   4   3   3.70   938/1380  3.70  3.51  3.94  3.78  3.70


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0   2   0   4   3   6   3.73  1043/1520  3.87  3.52  4.01  3.76  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0   1   1   2   1   9   4.14   971/1515  3.90  3.76  4.24  3.97  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0   1   0   4   4   5   3.86  1166/1511  3.60  3.71  4.27  4.00  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  8   0   0   3   1   2   3.83   600/ 994  3.83  3.77  3.94  3.73  3.83


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99    1         A    1        Required for Majors   2        Graduate      0        Major        0
  28-55     6        1.00-1.99    1         B   11
  56-83     6        2.00-2.99    9         C   10        General               0        Under-grad   24        Non-major   24
  84-150    4        3.00-3.49    3         D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    2         F    0        Electives             2        #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                19
                                            ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0201            University of Maryland                        Page 1142
Title       ELEMENTARY CALCULUS            Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Arlinghaus, Fra                Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  161
Questionnaires: 13                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  3  4  6  4.23  979/1674  4.26  4.07  4.27  4.07  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  870/1674  4.40  4.24  4.23  4.16  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  803/1423  4.38  4.38  4.27  4.16  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   3  0  1  2  2  5  4.10 1029/1609  4.28  4.12  4.22  4.05  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  662/1585  4.29  3.88  3.96  3.88  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 3 2 6  4.27  643/1535  4.24  4.17  4.08  3.89  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  419/1651  4.65  4.42  4.18  4.10  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  814/1673  4.44  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 6 1 4.14 849/1656  4.17  4.00  4.07  3.96  4.14


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  989/1586  4.56  4.45  4.43  4.37  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  1  0 11  4.83  737/1585  4.77  4.69  4.69  4.60  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 7  4.33  850/1582  4.38  4.13  4.26  4.17  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  1  0  1 10  4.67  495/1575  4.60  4.23  4.27  4.17  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1380  3.70  3.51  3.94  3.78  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.00  810/1520  3.87  3.52  4.01  3.76  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 2 2 3.67 1253/1515 3.90  3.76  4.24  3.97  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1 0 2 2 1 3.33 1351/1511 3.60 3.71  4.27  4.00  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                 7   4  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 994  3.83  3.77  3.94  3.73  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: Math 155 0301 (1914)          University of Maryland                              Page    3
Title Elementary Calculus                      Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Seidman, Thomas                    Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:        0
Questionnaires:  23                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	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	5	6	6	4	3.22	1592/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	6	7	3.61	1451/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	6	5	3.45	1284/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1557/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	7	3	6	3.45	1260/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1398/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	1097/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	9	6	2	3.42	1412/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1476/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	981/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	5	7	2	4	2.95	1517/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	2.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	8	4	6	2	2.91	1517/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1353/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1423/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1352/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1420/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	****

```
                                       Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 215  0101           University of Maryland                              Page 1143
Title       FINITE MATH FOR INFO S          Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  WANG, DAN                       Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     59
Questionnaires:  10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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  5  2  3  3.80 1385/1674  3.80  4.07  4.27 4.32  3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      1   0  0  0  3  3  3  4.00 1146/1674  4.00  4.24  4.23 4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  803/1423  4.30  4.38  4.27 4.36  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   7  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1377/1609  3.67  4.12  4.22 4.23  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   4  0  2  1  1  2  3.50 1223/1585  3.50  3.88  3.96 3.91  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  3  1  2  3.83 1083/1535  3.83  4.17  4.08 4.03  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  2  1  2  5  4.00 1097/1651  4.00  4.42  4.18 4.20  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  1  1  2  1  1  3.00 1540/1656  3.00  4.00  4.07 4.10  3.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  1  4  5  4.40 1004/1586  4.40  4.45  4.43 4.48  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  3  2  5  4.20 1423/1585  4.20  4.69  4.69 4.76  4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  3  1  3  3  3.60 1371/1582  3.60  4.13  4.26 4.35  3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  2  0  2  3  3  3.50 1367/1575  3.50  4.23  4.27 4.39  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   7  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 1304/1380  2.67  3.51  3.94 4.03  2.67

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4   0  0  1  3  0  2  3.50 1169/1520  3.50  3.52  4.01 4.03  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4   0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1253/1515  3.67  3.76  4.24 4.28  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4   0  0  1  0  2  3  4.17  976/1511  4.17  3.71  4.27 4.28  4.17
4. Were special techniques successful                    4   5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94 3.98  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1144
Title       INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  GOBBERT, MATTHI                Fall  2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      46
Questionnaires: 22                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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  4  6 12  4.36  817/1674  4.09  4.07  4.27  4.32  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  3  4 15  4.55  530/1674  4.11  4.24  4.23  4.26  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0 10 12  4.55  528/1423  4.27  4.38  4.27  4.36  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  9  0  0  3  5  5  4.15  974/1609  3.99  4.12  4.22  4.23  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  1  5  7  7  4.00  769/1585  3.79  3.88  3.96  3.91  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  0  1  1  3  7 4.33  578/1535  3.95  4.17  4.08  4.03  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  3  8 11  4.36  727/1651  4.14  4.42  4.18  4.20  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 22  5.00    1/1673  4.75  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 5 8 3 3.88 1146/1656 3.89  4.00  4.07  4.10  3.88

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  2  6 14  4.55  816/1586  4.20  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  2  4 16  4.64 1106/1585  4.60  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  6 11  5  3.95 1173/1582  3.87  4.13  4.26  4.35  3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  3  4  8  7  3.86 1235/1575  3.96  4.23  4.27  4.39  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 19 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1380 3.04 3.51 3.94 4.03 ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  726/1520  3.83  3.52  4.01  4.03  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  1  0  1  2  2  3.67 1253/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24  4.28  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0 2 1 1 2 3.50 1308/1511 3.81 3.71 4.27 4.28 3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 16  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  3.98  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  4.20  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99    0      A  13      Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0      Major       2
 28-55     7        1.00-1.99    0      B   4                                                     
 56-83     2        2.00-2.99    1      C   4      General              1    Under-grad   22      Non-major  20
 84-150    6        3.00-3.49    4      D   0                                                     
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    6      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other               18
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0201              University of Maryland                         Page 1145
Title       INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR           Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: KOROSTYSHEVSKIY                      Fall  2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      59
Questionnaires: 32                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept UMBC Level Sect
                Questions                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  3  3 14  9  2 3.13 1611/1674 4.09 4.07 4.27 4.32 3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0  2  6 14  7  1 2.97 1618/1674 4.11 4.24 4.23 4.26 2.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  0  4  1 10 11  4 3.33 1316/1423 4.27 4.38 4.27 4.36 3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2 11  3  2  8  5  1 2.95 1569/1609 3.99 4.12 4.22 4.23 2.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 10  4  2  5  6  4 3.19 1388/1585 3.79 3.88 3.96 3.91 3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 14  3  4  5  5  0 2.71 1497/1535 3.95 4.17 4.08 4.03 2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  1  2  4 12  6  5 3.28 1520/1651 4.14 4.42 4.18 4.20 3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  1  0  1  2 23  4 4.00 1566/1673 4.75 4.74 4.69 4.67 4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  1  2 13 11  1 3.32 1448/1656 3.89 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.32

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  3  3 12  9  3 3.20 1528/1586 4.20 4.45 4.43 4.48 3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3  0  0  1  7 11 10 4.03 1466/1585 4.60 4.69 4.69 4.76 4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  2  5  9 13  0 3.14 1490/1582 3.87 4.13 4.26 4.35 3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  2  2  4 10 11  2 3.24 1447/1575 3.96 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 19  5  2  3  0  0 1.80 1368/1380 3.04 3.51 3.94 4.03 1.80

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0  2  0  7  4  0 3.00 1353/1520 3.83 3.52 4.01 4.03 3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0  2  1  4  5  1 3.15 1403/1515 3.84 3.76 4.24 4.28 3.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19  0  1  2  6  2  2 3.15 1394/1511 3.81 3.71 4.27 4.28 3.15
4. Were special techniques successful                 19 11  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29  2  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30  0  0  0  1  1  0 3.50 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29  2  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 103 **** **** 4.41 4.07 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 30  1  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.48 4.45 ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   30  1  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 ****

                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    1      A   13       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       3
 28-55     5       1.00-1.99    0      B    8
 56-83     4       2.00-2.99    6      C    6       General              2    Under-grad  32      Non-major  29
 84-150    5       3.00-3.49    5      D    1
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5      F    1       Electives            3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               25
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0301              University of Maryland                          Page 1146
Title       INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   PITTENGER, ARTH               Fall   2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       53
Questionnaires:   40                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  2  8 29  4.63  458/1674  4.09  4.07  4.27 4.32  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2 12 25  4.53  554/1674  4.11  4.24  4.23 4.26  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  7 31  4.77  250/1423  4.27  4.38  4.27 4.36  4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  20  0  0  3  4 13  4.50  490/1609  3.99  4.12  4.22 4.23  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 16  0  1  7  8  7  3.91  893/1585  3.79  3.88  3.96 3.91  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 24 0 1 2 3 9  4.33  578/1535  3.95  4.17  4.08 4.03  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  7 12 19  4.26  866/1651  4.14  4.42  4.18 4.20  4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 39  5.00    1/1673  4.75  4.74  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 1 3 12 19 4.40  522/1656  3.89  4.00  4.07 4.10  4.40

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  2  6 31  4.74  517/1586  4.20  4.45  4.43 4.48  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  3 36  4.92  453/1585  4.60  4.69  4.69 4.76  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  8  8 22  4.31  882/1582  3.87  4.13  4.26 4.35  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  1  1 11 25  4.49  717/1575  3.96  4.23  4.27 4.39  4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 26 3 0 3 1 6  3.54 1024/1380  3.04  3.51  3.94 4.03  3.54

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29 0  0  0  5  1  5  4.00  810/1520  3.83  3.52  4.01 4.03  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 29 0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  594/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24 4.28  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 29 0 0 1 1 2 7  4.36  788/1511  3.81  3.71  4.27 4.28  4.36
4. Were special techniques successful                  29   7  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94 3.98  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  37   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23 4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 1 2 0  3.67 ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19 4.36  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41 4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 1 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48 4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 1 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    38   1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39 4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                38   1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14 4.63  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 1 1 0  3.50 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98 3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 0 0 1 1 0  3.50 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93 4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       38   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   38   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.82  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09 4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    38   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26 4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      38   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44 4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       38   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     38   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 4.50  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0401            University of Maryland                                    Page 1147
Title       INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR        Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   LO, JAMES T                 Fall   2005                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      54
Questionnaires: 30                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 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   4  15  11  4.23  979/1674  4.09  4.07  4.27  4.32  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3  12  15  4.40  737/1674  4.11  4.24  4.23  4.26  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1  15  14  4.43  660/1423  4.27  4.38  4.27  4.36  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  10   0   0   3   7  10  4.35  715/1609  3.99  4.12  4.22  4.23  4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   0   3   4   5  11  4.04  742/1585  3.79  3.88  3.96  3.91  4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11  0   0   0  11   8  4.42  481/1535  3.95  4.17  4.08  4.03  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   8  21  4.67  330/1651  4.14  4.42  4.18  4.20  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   0  29  5.00    1/1673  4.75  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0   0   5  15   4  3.96 1039/1656  3.89  4.00  4.07  4.10  3.96


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   4  13  13  4.30 1104/1586  4.20  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   6  24  4.80  811/1585  4.60  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   7  11  11  4.07 1099/1582  3.87  4.13  4.26  4.35  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   3  14  12  4.23  975/1575  3.96  4.23  4.27  4.39  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 20  0   2   2   1   4  3.78  887/1380  3.04  3.51  3.94  4.03  3.78


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   0   3   5   5  4.15  734/1520  3.83  3.52  4.01  4.03  4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   1   3   4   5  4.00 1024/1515  3.84  3.76  4.24  4.28  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0   0   0   3   4   6  4.23  917/1511  3.81  3.71  4.27  4.28  4.23
4. Were special techniques successful                  16   8   1   1   0   2   2  3.50 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  3.98  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  28   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19  4.36  ****


            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 1  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.45  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       28   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   28   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    28   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      28   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       28   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     28   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****

                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0        A   12      Required for Majors  1     Graduate     1      Major        0
  28-55     8       1.00-1.99   0        B   13
  56-83     5       2.00-2.99   4        C    3      General              2     Under-grad  29      Non-major   30
  84-150    3       3.00-3.49   9        D    0
  Grad.     1       3.50-4.00   5        F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                    responses to be significant
I    0          Other              25
?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0101                University of Maryland                                      Page 1148
Title           INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT              Baltimore County                                     JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     CAMPBELL, ROBER                        Fall  2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      60
Questionnaires:  30                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2   1  19   8  4.10 1115/1674  4.00  4.07  4.27 4.32  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   3   5  10  11  4.00 1146/1674  3.66  4.24  4.23 4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   2  10  17  4.43  660/1423  3.97  4.38  4.27 4.36  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   7   0   2   5   8   6  3.86 1254/1609  3.64  4.12  4.22 4.23  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   0   1   5   7   8  4.05  742/1585  4.04  3.88  3.96 3.91  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0   1   3   4   9  4.24  691/1535  4.04  4.17  4.08 4.03  4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   2   9  18  4.55  458/1651  4.21  4.42  4.18 4.20  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  30  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0   1   4  14   6  4.00  955/1656  3.44  4.00  4.07 4.10  4.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   5  12  11  4.21 1176/1586  4.38  4.45  4.43 4.48  4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   7  21  4.75  917/1585  4.47  4.69  4.69 4.76  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   1   3  11  10   3  3.39 1444/1582  3.45  4.13  4.26 4.35  3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   3   3   6   8   8  3.54 1361/1575  3.72  4.23  4.27 4.39  3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 9  4   7   4   4   0  2.42 1335/1380  2.51  3.51  3.94 4.03  2.42

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0  3   1   3   2   1  2.70 1445/1520  2.75  3.52  4.01 4.03  2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0  0   2   3   0   6  3.91 1137/1515  3.45  3.76  4.24 4.28  3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0  0   1   3   0   7  4.18  962/1511  3.69  3.71  4.27 4.28  4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                  19   8   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94 3.98  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2        0.00-0.99    1          A   14         Required for Majors   0      Graduate     1        Major       1
  28-55     2        1.00-1.99    0          B   10
  56-83     9        2.00-2.99    5          C    4         General               0      Under-grad  29        Non-major  29
  84-150    8        3.00-3.49    6          D    0
  Grad.     1        3.50-4.00   10          F    0         Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                            I    0         Other                26
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0201              University of Maryland                           Page 1149
Title          INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    LYNN, YEN-MOW                      Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  9                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2   1   5   1  3.56 1495/1674  4.00  4.07  4.27  4.32  3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   2   2   3   1  3.11 1597/1674  3.66  4.24  4.23  4.26  3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   2   2   3  3.67 1214/1423  3.97  4.38  4.27  4.36  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   1   4   2   0  3.14 1541/1609  3.64  4.12  4.22  4.23  3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   0   1   1   3   2  3.86  956/1585  4.04  3.88  3.96  3.91  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0   0   3   2   1  3.67 1207/1535  4.04  4.17  4.08  4.03  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   3   2   3  4.00 1097/1651  4.21  4.42  4.18  4.20  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1   1   3   3   0  3.00 1540/1656  3.44  4.00  4.07  4.10  3.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   2   3   3  4.13 1237/1586  4.38  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38 1328/1585  4.47  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1   0   3   3   1  3.38 1448/1582  3.45  4.13  4.26  4.35  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   4   3   1  3.63 1343/1575  3.72  4.23  4.27  4.39  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1380  2.51  3.51  3.94  4.03  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/1520  2.75  3.52  4.01  4.03  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/1515  3.45  3.76  4.24  4.28  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/1511  3.69  3.71  4.27  4.28  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  3.98  ****
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0301            University of Maryland                          Page 1150
Title          INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT      Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    LYNN, YEN-MOW                  Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires: 15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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  6  7  4.33  854/1674  4.00  4.07  4.27  4.32  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  5  4  5  3.87 1298/1674  3.66  4.24  4.23  4.26  3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  4  4  5  3.80 1155/1423  3.97  4.38  4.27  4.36  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  1  1  0  6  4  3.92 1211/1609  3.64  4.12  4.22  4.23  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  584/1585  4.04  3.88  3.96  3.91  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  703/1535  4.04  4.17  4.08  4.03  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  2  3  2  8  4.07 1057/1651  4.21  4.42  4.18  4.20  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  0  7  4  1  3.31 1455/1656  3.44  4.00  4.07  4.10  3.31

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  431/1586  4.38  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  1  2  3  8  4.29 1383/1585  4.47  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  1  4  5  3  3.57 1381/1582  3.45  4.13  4.26  4.35  3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  1  4  3  6  4.00 1138/1575  3.72  4.23  4.27  4.39  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  9  1  1  2  1  0  2.60 1311/1380  2.51  3.51  3.94  4.03  2.60

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  0  3  1  0  2.80 1424/1520  2.75  3.52  4.01  4.03  2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  1  1  1  1  1  3.00 1420/1515  3.45  3.76  4.24  4.28  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0  0  4  1  0  3.20 1383/1511  3.69  3.71  4.27  4.28  3.20
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  3  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  3.98  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1151
Title       MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS         Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ALLEN, KEVIN                   Fall  2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     60
Questionnaires: 35                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	25	4.63	458/1674	4.21	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	554/1674	4.01	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	22	4.57	493/1423	4.14	4.38	4.27	4.36	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	1061/1609	3.71	4.12	4.22	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	851/1585	3.74	3.88	3.96	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	373/1535	4.08	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	14	19	4.49	553/1651	3.93	4.42	4.18	4.20	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1673	4.87	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	465/1656	3.65	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	474/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	10	25	4.71	1002/1585	4.54	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	557/1582	3.71	4.13	4.26	4.35	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	24	4.63	551/1575	4.04	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	27	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/1380	2.80	3.51	3.94	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1520	2.90	3.52	4.01	4.03	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1515	4.35	3.76	4.24	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1511	3.13	3.71	4.27	4.28	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1152
Title        MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS          Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MINKOFF, SUSAN                  Fall  2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      61
Questionnaires: 41                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   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   7  12  22  4.37  817/1674  4.21  4.07  4.27  4.32  4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0  12  16  13  4.02 1132/1674  4.01  4.24  4.23  4.26  4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   6  18  16  4.20  894/1423  4.14  4.38  4.27  4.36  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  16   1   1  10   3   9  3.75 1320/1609  3.71  4.12  4.22  4.23  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11   2   2  10   6  10  3.67 1121/1585  3.74  3.88  3.96  3.91  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 18  0   2   3   7  11  4.17  757/1535  4.08  4.17  4.08  4.03  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   3   6  13  17  4.05 1064/1651  3.93  4.42  4.18  4.20  4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0  14  25  4.64 1093/1673  4.87  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0   2  14  13   5  3.62 1324/1656  3.65  4.00  4.07  4.10  3.62


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   1   6  14  19  4.20 1191/1586  4.21  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   7  33  4.78  853/1585  4.54  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   6  12  14   8  3.54 1395/1582  3.71  4.13  4.26  4.35  3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   4   8   9  19  4.00 1138/1575  4.04  4.23  4.27  4.39  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8   5   8  11   7   2  2.79 1284/1380  2.80  3.51  3.94  4.03  2.79


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24  0   6   1   2   3   5  3.00 1353/1520  2.90  3.52  4.01  4.03  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24  0   0   1   2   4  10  4.35  808/1515  4.35  3.76  4.24  4.28  4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25  0   3   2   4   4   3  3.13 1400/1511  3.13  3.71  4.27  4.28  3.13
4. Were special techniques successful                  26  14   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  3.98  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  39   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23  4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 2  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           39   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33  4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20  4.48  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    40   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                40   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.63  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 40   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       40   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   40   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    40   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      40   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       40   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     40   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0201            University of Maryland                        Page 1152
Title          MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS      Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    MINKOFF, SUSAN              Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      61
Questionnaires: 41                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    4        0.00-0.99   0        A   15        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major        2
 28-55   12        1.00-1.99   0        B   18
 56-83    8        2.00-2.99   5        C    7        General              1     Under-grad  41       Non-major   39
 84-150   1        3.00-3.49   5        D    0
 Grad.    0        3.50-4.00  13        F    0        Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               36
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0301          University of Maryland                        Page 1153
Title      MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS        Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   MUSCEDERE, MICH             Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    76
Questionnaires: 39               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	2	6	11	14	3.64	1459/1674	4.21	4.07	4.27	4.32	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	3	11	5	14	3.46	1515/1674	4.01	4.24	4.23	4.26	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	7	9	15	3.67	1214/1423	4.14	4.38	4.27	4.36	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	3	3	5	6	5	3.32	1504/1609	3.71	4.12	4.22	4.23	3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	3	2	3	4	8	3.60	1164/1585	3.74	3.88	3.96	3.91	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	4	1	4	3	9	3.57	1256/1535	4.08	4.17	4.08	4.03	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	9	2	9	6	12	3.26	1522/1651	3.93	4.42	4.18	4.20	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	212/1673	4.87	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	8	3	10	7	4	2.88	1584/1656	3.65	4.00	4.07	4.10	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	3	6	11	14	3.67	1442/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.48	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	4	1	8	23	4.13	1448/1585	4.54	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	8	6	11	5	9	3.03	1502/1582	3.71	4.13	4.26	4.35	3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	3	7	9	12	3.49	1374/1575	4.04	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	6	2	2	1	5	2.81	1279/1380	2.80	3.51	3.94	4.03	2.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	4	1	1	1	3	2.80	1424/1520	2.90	3.52	4.01	4.03	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	****/1515	4.35	3.76	4.24	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	3	1	1	0	4	3.11	****/1511	3.13	3.71	4.27	4.28	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.36	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: MATH 251H 0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1154
Title                                      Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    HOFFMAN, KATHLE             Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
Questionnaires: 17              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  2 13  4.65  432/1674  4.65  4.07  4.27  4.32  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71  325/1674  4.71  4.24  4.23  4.26  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  5 10  4.47  611/1423  4.47  4.38  4.27  4.36  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  567/1609  4.45  4.12  4.22  4.23  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  1  1  4  5  4.18  622/1585  4.18  3.88  3.96  3.91  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9 0  0  0  3  5  4.63  268/1535  4.63  4.17  4.08  4.03  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  4  3  9  4.18  956/1651  4.18  4.42  4.18  4.20  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  8  9  4.53 1189/1673  4.53  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0  0  1  7  6  4.36  588/1656  4.36  4.00  4.07  4.10  4.36


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  474/1586  4.76  4.45  4.43  4.48  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  340/1585  4.94  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  4  6  7  4.18 1016/1582  4.18  4.13  4.26  4.35  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  4  2 11  4.41  806/1575  4.41  4.23  4.27  4.39  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12 0 0  3  2  0  3.40 1094/1380  3.40  3.51  3.94  4.03  3.40


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0  0  0  5  1  4.17  726/1520  4.17  3.52  4.01  4.03  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00 1024/1515  4.00  3.76  4.24  4.28  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0  0  0  3  3  4.50  642/1511  4.50  3.71  4.27  4.28  4.50


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3       0.00-0.99   0        A    5      Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major        6
 28-55     6       1.00-1.99   0        B    6
 56-83     4       2.00-2.99   0        C    2      General               1    Under-grad  17      Non-major   11
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49   1        D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   9        F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                16
                                        ?    4
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1155
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I          Baltimore County                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  RATHINAM, MURUH                  Fall  2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      36
Questionnaires: 23                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  1  3  7 11  4.13 1085/1674  4.12  4.07  4.27  4.26  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  2  6  7  8  3.91 1258/1674  3.98  4.24  4.23  4.21  3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  2 10 11  4.39  707/1423  4.35  4.38  4.27  4.27  4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0 13  1  1  2  2  4  3.70 1355/1609  3.80  4.12  4.22  4.27  3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  1  6  5  4  3.75 1049/1585  3.72  3.88  3.96  3.95  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11  0  0  1  8  3  4.17  767/1535  4.08  4.17  4.08  4.15  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  2  0  4 17  4.57  445/1651  4.34  4.42  4.18  4.16  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00    1/1673  4.97  4.74  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  0  0  5  7  6  4.06  924/1656  4.03  4.00  4.07  4.07  4.06


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  1  4  6 10  4.19 1191/1586  4.23  4.45  4.43  4.42  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  2  8 12  4.45 1267/1585  4.56  4.69  4.69  4.66  4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  6  9  5  3.77 1290/1582  3.75  4.13  4.26  4.26  3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  1  9  5  6  3.76 1284/1575  3.94  4.23  4.27  4.25  3.76


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0  2  0  1  1  0  2.25 ****/1520  2.80  3.52  4.01  4.09  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0  1  0  2  1  0  2.75 ****/1515  4.83  3.76  4.24  4.32  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19  0  1  0  3  0  0  2.50 ****/1511  4.20  3.71  4.27  4.34  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0     A    4       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0       Major       12
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0     B    7
  56-83      7       2.00-2.99    1     C    7       General              1     Under-grad   23       Non-major   11
  84-150     5       3.00-3.49    4     D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   10     F    1       Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               19
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1156
Title           INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I     Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     KOGAN, JACOB              Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      39
Questionnaires:  19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  1  4  6  8  4.11 1115/1674  4.12  4.07  4.27 4.26  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  2  2  8  7  4.05 1111/1674  3.98  4.24  4.23 4.21  4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  5  3 11  4.32  792/1423  4.35  4.38  4.27 4.27  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   9   0  1  2  4  3  3.90 1224/1609  3.80  4.12  4.22 4.27  3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6   1  2  2  3  5  3.69 1100/1585  3.72  3.88  3.96 3.95  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9  1  0  2  2  5  4.00  870/1535  4.08  4.17  4.08 4.15  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  2  4  3 10  4.11 1031/1651  4.34  4.42  4.18 4.16  4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  1 18  4.95  424/1673  4.97  4.74  4.69 4.68  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0  0  3 10  3  4.00  955/1656  4.03  4.00  4.07 4.07  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0  1  0 10  7  4.28 1128/1586  4.23  4.45  4.43 4.42  4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0  0  1  4 13  4.67 1071/1585  4.56  4.69  4.69 4.66  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  1  1  5  6  5  3.72 1320/1582  3.75  4.13  4.26 4.26  3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   1  0  5  2 10  4.11 1090/1575  3.94  4.23  4.27 4.25  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15 0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94 4.01  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  1  1  1  2  0  2.80 1424/1520  2.80  3.52  4.01 4.09  2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  289/1515  4.83  3.76  4.24 4.32  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0  0  2  0  3  4.20  955/1511  4.20  3.71  4.27 4.34  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                 14   4   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94 3.96  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1        A    9       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     1      Major       9
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0        B    4                                                     
  56-83      5       2.00-2.99    2        C    1       General              2    Under-grad  18      Non-major  10
  84-150     2       3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    8        F    0       Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other               13
                                          ?    5
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 302  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1157
Title         INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II       Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   GOWDA, MUDDAPPA              Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires:  29                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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   4   8  16  4.43  735/1674   4.43  4.07  4.27  4.26  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   2   8  18  4.57  495/1674   4.57  4.24  4.23  4.21  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   1   2   8  17  4.46  623/1423   4.46  4.38  4.27  4.27  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  15   0   1   3   3   6  4.08 1048/1609   4.08  4.12  4.22  4.27  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  19   2   0   2   3   3  3.50 1223/1585   3.50  3.88  3.96  3.95  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10   0   1   2   7   9  4.26  655/1535   4.26  4.17  4.08  4.15  4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   2   3   5  19  4.41  658/1651   4.41  4.42  4.18  4.16  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0  29  5.00    1/1673   5.00  4.74  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0   0   0   1   6  17  4.67  257/1656   4.67  4.00  4.07  4.07  4.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   0  27  5.00    1/1586   5.00  4.45  4.43  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   2  25  4.93  453/1585   4.93  4.69  4.69  4.66  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   1   2  24  4.85  199/1582   4.85  4.13  4.26  4.26  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1   0   0   2  24  4.78  327/1575   4.78  4.23  4.27  4.25  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 18   0   1   0   1   5  4.43 ****/1380   ****  3.51  3.94  4.01  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0   1   1   0   1   4  3.86 ****/1520   ****  3.52  4.01  4.09  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22  0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43 ****/1515   ****  3.76  4.24  4.32  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57 ****/1511   ****  3.71  4.27  4.34  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   22  6   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 994   ****  3.77  3.94  3.96  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99    0        A    6      Required for Majors   1      Graduate      0      Major       23
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99    1        B    8
 56-83     3        2.00-2.99    4        C   10      General               0      Under-grad   29      Non-major    6
 84-150   13        3.00-3.49    9        D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    5        F    1      Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                27
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 381  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1158
Title          LIN. METH/OPER RESEARC        Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    GULER, OSMAN                      Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       9
Questionnaires:   5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  243/1674  4.80  4.07  4.27  4.26  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20 1001/1674  4.20  4.24  4.23  4.21  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  262/1423  4.75  4.38  4.27  4.27  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  852/1609  4.25  4.12  4.22  4.27  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1585  ****  3.88  3.96  3.95  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 373/1535  4.50  4.17  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  175/1651  4.80  4.42  4.18  4.16  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  5  0  4.00 1566/1673  4.00  4.74  4.69  4.68  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 615/1656  4.33  4.00  4.07  4.07  4.33


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  753/1586  4.60  4.45  4.43  4.42  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.66  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  777/1582  4.40  4.13  4.26  4.26  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  579/1575  4.60  4.23  4.27  4.25  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94  4.01  ****


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  810/1520  4.00  3.52  4.01  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1303/1515  3.50  3.76  4.24  4.32  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1420/1511  3.00  3.71  4.27  4.34  3.00


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 401  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1159
Title      MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS                Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   GOWDA, MUDDAPPA                      Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.07  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.24  4.23  4.31  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1423  5.00  4.38  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1609  5.00  4.12  4.22  4.30  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1585  5.00  3.88  3.96  4.01  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1535  5.00  4.17  4.08  4.18  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1097/1651  4.00  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1656  5.00  4.00  4.07  4.19  5.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1586  5.00  4.45  4.43  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1582  5.00  4.13  4.26  4.31  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1575  5.00  4.23  4.27  4.35  5.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1353/1520  3.00  3.52  4.01  4.18  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1024/1515  4.00  3.76  4.24  4.40  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1050/1511  4.00  3.71  4.27  4.45  4.00
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 404  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1160
Title        INTRO PART DIFF EQ I          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  BELL, JONATHAN                Fall  2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires: 24                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               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  2  1 10  4  6  3.48 1521/1674  3.48  4.07  4.27  4.42  3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  4  9  4  6  3.52 1489/1674  3.52  4.24  4.23  4.31  3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  3  3  5 13  4.17  915/1423  4.17  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   4  0  0  4  7  7  4.17  963/1609  4.17  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  5  2  4  4  7  3.27 1356/1585  3.27  3.88  3.96  4.01  3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 2 0 3 7 9  4.00  870/1535  4.00  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  1  0  3  6 11  4.24  889/1651  4.24  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  0  0 20  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 2 5 5 3 1 2.75 1599/1656  2.75  4.00  4.07  4.19  2.75

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  2  2  5 14  4.35 1064/1586  4.35  4.45  4.43  4.46  4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  1 21  4.87  664/1585  4.87  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  6  6  3  4  4  2.74 1550/1582  2.74  4.13  4.26  4.31  2.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  6  3  4  5  6  3.08 1476/1575  3.08  4.23  4.27  4.35  3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 9 3 3 4 3  2.50 1324/1380  2.50  3.51  3.94  4.04  2.50

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 4 1 3 1 2  2.64 1459/1520  2.64  3.52  4.01  4.18  2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 6 1 2 0 2  2.18 1488/1515  2.18  3.76  4.24  4.40  2.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 4 1 2 1 2  2.60 1472/1511  2.60  3.71  4.27  4.45  2.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   9  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  4.19  ****

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1 1 0 1 0  2.33 ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19  4.21  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21  0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.86  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 2 0 0  2.33 ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20   3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20   1  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       21   2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  5.00  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     4       0.00-0.99    1        A    6        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     10       Major        1
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0        B   12
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99    0        C    2        General              3    Under-grad   14       Non-major   23
  84-150    3       3.00-3.49    4        D    0
  Grad.    10       3.50-4.00    4        F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               18
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 407  0101           University of Maryland                              Page 1161
Title        MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH       Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  HORTA, ARNALDO                   Fall  2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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  4  9  4.47  671/1674  4.47  4.07  4.27 4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  379/1674  4.67  4.24  4.23 4.31  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  286/1423  4.73  4.38  4.27 4.34  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  812/1609  4.29  4.12  4.22 4.30  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  5  1  4  3.90  907/1585  3.90  3.88  3.96 4.01  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0  0  1  4  5  4.40  508/1535  4.40  4.17  4.08 4.18  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  254/1651  4.73  4.42  4.18 4.23  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  0  0  7  5  4.15  838/1656  4.15  4.00  4.07 4.19  4.15


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  1  2 11  4.53  826/1586  4.53  4.45  4.43 4.46  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  0 14  4.87  664/1585  4.87  4.69  4.69 4.76  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  0  5  9  4.40  777/1582  4.40  4.13  4.26 4.31  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  0  3 11  4.60  579/1575  4.60  4.23  4.27 4.35  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 13 0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94 4.04  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  645/1520  4.25  3.52  4.01 4.18  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  629/1515  4.50  3.76  4.24 4.40  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0  0  0  2  2  4.50  642/1511  4.50  3.71  4.27 4.45  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   3  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94 4.19  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    4       Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major        10
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    7                                                       
  56-83      3      2.00-2.99   1        C    3       General              4    Under-grad   15      Non-major     5
  84-150     5      3.00-3.49   4        D    0                                                       
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4        F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                9
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 410  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1162
Title       INTRO COMPLEX ANALYSIS         Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  PITTENGER, ARTH               Fall  2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      25
Questionnaires:  15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  1  1  2  11  4.53  570/1674  4.53  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  3  12  4.80  215/1674  4.80  4.24  4.23  4.31  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  2  13  4.87  160/1423  4.87  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3   0  0  2  2   7  4.45  567/1609  4.45  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0  0  2  6   4  4.17  642/1585  4.17  3.88  3.96  4.01  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5   0  0  2  4   3  4.11  817/1535  4.11  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0  0  2  6   6  4.29  832/1651  4.29  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  0  14  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   1  0  1  3   9  4.36  588/1656  4.36  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.36

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  1  3  11  4.67  663/1586  4.67  4.45  4.43  4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  0  15  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0  0  2  1  11  4.64  467/1582  4.64  4.13  4.26  4.31  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  2  3  10  4.53  658/1575  4.53  4.23  4.27  4.35  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 13   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94  4.04  ****

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/1520  ****  3.52  4.01  4.18  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/1515  ****  3.76  4.24  4.40  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0   0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/1511  ****  3.71  4.27  4.45  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  1   1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  4.19  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 426  0101            University of Maryland                             Page 1163
Title        INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB         Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SOANE, ANA MARI               Fall  2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:   7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  195/1674  4.86  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  176/1674  4.86  4.24  4.23  4.31  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  167/1423  4.86  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  157/1609  4.83  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  0  1  2  2  3.29 1352/1585  3.29  3.88  3.96  4.01  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  131/1535  4.80  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  145/1651  4.86  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  493/1656  4.43  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.43

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1586  5.00  4.45  4.43  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  199/1582  4.86  4.13  4.26  4.31  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  225/1575  4.86  4.23  4.27  4.35  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1380  5.00  3.51  3.94  4.04  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1520  5.00  3.52  4.01  4.18  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1303/1515  3.50  3.76  4.24  4.40  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1511  ****  3.71  4.27  4.45  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   5  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  4.19  ****

                                    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     1      Major      6
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B   0                                                     
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99   0       C   0       General               5     Under-grad   6      Non-major  1
  84-150     4      3.00-3.49   1       D   0
  Grad.      1      3.50-4.00   3       F   0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                 1
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 430  0101                University of Maryland                        Page 1164
Title      MATRIX ANALYSIS                      Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ZWECK, JOHN                            Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 19                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   1   2   3  13  4.47   655/1674  4.47  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   7  11  4.53   554/1674  4.53  4.24  4.23  4.31  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   1   3   6   9  4.21   878/1423  4.21  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   4   0   1   2   3   8  4.29   812/1609  4.29  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   0   0   3   7   6  4.19   622/1585  4.19  3.88  3.96  4.01  4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 6  0   0   1   2   8  4.64   260/1535  4.64  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          2   0   0   0   2   7   8  4.35   741/1651  4.35  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                2   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00     1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   3   6   8  4.29   667/1656  4.29  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.29


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   4  15  4.79   431/1586  4.79  4.45  4.43  4.46  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89   591/1585  4.89  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0   0   1   5  12  4.61   510/1582  4.61  4.13  4.26  4.31  4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   2   3  14  4.63   537/1575  4.63  4.23  4.27  4.35  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 14  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94  4.04  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   2   1   2   1  3.33  1252/1520  3.33  3.52  4.01  4.18  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0   1   1   1   3  4.00  1024/1515  4.00  3.76  4.24  4.40  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  1  0   2   2   1  3.33  1351/1511  3.33  3.71  4.27  4.45  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                13   4  0   0   2   0   0  3.00  ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  4.19  ****

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0  0  0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19  4.21  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99   2       A   9     Required for Majors  1     Graduate    4      Major      11
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B   6
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99   2       C   1     General              7     Under-grad  15     Non-major   8
  84-150     5       3.00-3.49   1       D   0
  Grad.      4       3.50-4.00   6       F   0     Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   1                               responses to be significant
                                         I   0     Other               11
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 441  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1165
Title      INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  GOBBERT, MATTHI                   Fall  2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires:  4                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  954/1674  4.25  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  270/1674  4.75  4.24  4.23  4.31  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1423  5.00  4.38  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  222/1609  4.75  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  0  1  1  3.00 1440/1585  3.00  3.88  3.96  4.01  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1535  5.00  4.17  4.08  4.18  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1651  5.00  4.42  4.18  4.23  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  2  2  4.50  381/1656  4.50  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.50


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  496/1586  4.75  4.45  4.43  4.46  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  632/1582  4.50  4.13  4.26  4.31  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  692/1575  4.50  4.23  4.27  4.35  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  2  1  1  3.75  902/1380  3.75  3.51  3.94  4.04  3.75


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1353/1520  3.00  3.52  4.01  4.18  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1024/1515  4.00  3.76  4.24  4.40  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1050/1511  4.00  3.71  4.27  4.45  4.00


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 479  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1166
Title         MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S       Baltimore County                                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   ARMSTRONG, THOM                  Fall   2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires: 10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   5   4  4.30   891/1674  4.30  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   3   5  4.20  1001/1674  4.20  4.24  4.23  4.31  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   8   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1423  ****  4.38  4.27  4.34  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   0   3   5  4.63   353/1609  4.63  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1585  ****  3.88  3.96  4.01  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   1   3   5  4.44   454/1535  4.44  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   0   0   0   2   7  4.78   208/1651  4.78  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00     1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   1   3   6  4.50   381/1656  4.50  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.50

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  1074/1586  4.33  4.45  4.43  4.46  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   689/1585  4.86  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   1   0   1   4  4.33   850/1582  4.33  4.13  4.26  4.31  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   886/1575  4.33  4.23  4.27  4.35  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  3  0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94  4.04  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1520  ****  3.52  4.01  4.18  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/1515  ****  3.76  4.24  4.40  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/1511  ****  3.71  4.27  4.45  ****

              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.65  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.57  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.46  ****

                              Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 486  0101            University of Maryland                                        Page 1167
Title       INTRO TO DYNAMICAL SYS          Baltimore County                                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  HOFFMAN, KATHLE                    Fall  2005                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  1  1  0  7  4.44  703/1674   4.44  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  1  1  1  0  6  4.00 1146/1674   4.00  4.24  4.23  4.31  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  0  2  1  5  4.00 1016/1423   4.00  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  490/1609   4.50  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  1  0  1  1  2  3.60 1164/1585   3.60  3.88  3.96  4.01  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 0 2  6  4.33  578/1535   4.33  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  127/1651   4.89  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  6  3  4.33 1361/1673   4.33  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 3  4  4.38  561/1656   4.38  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.38

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  453/1586   4.78  4.45  4.43  4.46  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67 1071/1585   4.67  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  2  4  4.11 1070/1582   4.11  4.13  4.26  4.31  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  1  0  1  1  6  4.22  983/1575   4.22  4.23  4.27  4.35  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 2 0 0 1  1  2.75 1290/1380   2.75  3.51  3.94  4.04  2.75

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  295/1520   4.67  3.52  4.01  4.18  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  483/1515   4.67  3.76  4.24  4.40  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 0  3  5.00    1/1511   5.00  3.71  4.27  4.45  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   6  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 994   ****  3.77  3.94  4.19  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 1 0  0  3.00 ****/ 278   ****  3.15  4.19  4.21  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 1 0  0  3.00 ****/ 260   ****  3.40  4.46  4.24  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259   ****  3.65  4.33  4.31  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233   ****  ****  4.20  4.10  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 490A 0101          University of Maryland                    Page 1168
Title       INTRO TO GAME THEORY         Baltimore County                     JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ARMSTRONG, THOM                 Fall   2005                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  735/1674  4.43  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  1  1  3  2  3.86 1305/1674  3.86  4.24  4.23  4.31  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1423  ****  4.38  4.27  4.34  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  490/1609  4.50  4.12  4.22  4.30  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 4 1 3.86  956/1585  3.86  3.88  3.96  4.01  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 737/1535  4.20  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  1  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  768/1651  4.33  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.00 955/1656  4.00  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33 1074/1586  4.33  4.45  4.43  4.46  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67 1071/1585  4.67  4.69  4.69  4.76  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 3 1 1 3.33 1457/1582  3.33  4.13  4.26  4.31  3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  1  1  3  1  3.67 1329/1575  3.67  4.23  4.27  4.35  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 666/1380  4.00  3.51  3.94  4.04  4.00


                              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       5
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B    1
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General               3    Under-grad   7      Non-major   2
  84-150    3      3.00-3.49   1        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   2        F    0        Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 1
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 490B 0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1169
Title          NUM SOL PARTIAL DIFF E     Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    MINKOFF, SUSAN             Fall  2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires: 10                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   243/1674  4.80  4.07  4.27  4.42  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   138/1674  4.90  4.24  4.23  4.31  4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   146/1423  4.89  4.38  4.27  4.34  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1609  5.00  4.12  4.22  4.30  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89    96/1585  4.89  3.88  3.96  4.01  4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   101/1535  4.89  4.17  4.08  4.18  4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   116/1651  4.90  4.42  4.18  4.23  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  1040/1673  4.70  4.74  4.69  4.67  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56   345/1656  4.56  4.00  4.07  4.19  4.56


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00     1/1586  5.00  4.45  4.43  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00     1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   152/1582  4.90  4.13  4.26  4.31  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   171/1575  4.90  4.23  4.27  4.35  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  1  1  0  1  2  5  4.11   612/1380  4.11  3.51  3.94  4.04  4.11


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4  0  0  1  0  1  4  4.33   572/1520  4.33  3.52  4.01  4.18  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4  0  0  0  1  0  5  4.67   483/1515  4.67  3.76  4.24  4.40  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4  0  0  0  1  0  5  4.67   507/1511  4.67  3.71  4.27  4.45  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   2  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/ 994  5.00  3.77  3.94  4.19  5.00


                              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     3        Major       5
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0        B     4                                                          
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0        C     0        General               3     Under-grad   7        Non-major   5
  84-150    1      3.00-3.49    0        D     0                                                          
  Grad.     3      3.50-4.00    3        F     0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P     0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I     0        Other                 4
                                         ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 601  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1170
Title      MEASURE THEORY                 Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   GOWDA, MUDDAPPA             Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires:  16                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94  103/1674  4.94  4.07  4.27  4.44  4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94   96/1674  4.94  4.24  4.23  4.34  4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  1  1  2  12  4.56  505/1423  4.56  4.38  4.27  4.28  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  0  0  3  12  4.80  173/1609  4.80  4.12  4.22  4.34  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  2  0  1  4  9  4.13  682/1585  4.13  3.88  3.96  4.23  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  0  2  0  13  4.73  184/1535  4.73  4.17  4.08  4.27  4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  0  1  14  4.75  231/1651  4.75  4.42  4.18  4.32  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  16  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  1  0  0  1  1  12  4.79  163/1656  4.79  4.00  4.07  4.15  4.79


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  1  0  15  4.88  266/1586  4.88  4.45  4.43  4.50  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0  16  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88  180/1582  4.88  4.13  4.26  4.33  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  1  0  15  4.88  203/1575  4.88  4.23  4.27  4.30  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  8  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1380  5.00  3.51  3.94  3.85  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  10  0  0  1  1  1  3  4.00  810/1520  4.00  3.52  4.01  4.19  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  10  0  0  0  3  0  3  4.00  1024/1515  4.00  3.76  4.24  4.47  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  10  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  816/1511  4.33  3.71  4.27  4.49  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  4  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  4.07  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.62  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.54  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.26  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  3.10  3.98  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  77  ****  3.20  3.93  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.35  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.46  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  61  ****  4.09  4.09  4.46  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  4.67  4.26  4.59  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  50  ****  4.33  4.44  4.64  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.84  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.64  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned       Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2       0.00-0.99   0      A   8       Required for Majors   0    Graduate     5     Major      14
  28-55    0       1.00-1.99   0      B   6
  56-83    0       2.00-2.99   0      C   0       General               7    Under-grad  11     Non-major   2
  84-150   2       3.00-3.49   0      D   0
  Grad.    5       3.50-4.00   7      F   0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
```

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 620  0101                University of Maryland                                   Page 1171
Title       NUMERICAL ANALYSIS I                   Baltimore County                                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI                        Fall  2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:  8                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  1  1  5  4.25  954/1674  4.25  4.07  4.27 4.44  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  0  0  7  4.63  433/1674  4.63  4.24  4.23 4.34  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  262/1423  4.75  4.38  4.27 4.28  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  136/1609  4.88  4.12  4.22 4.34  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  167/1585  4.75  3.88  3.96 4.23  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  112/1535  4.86  4.17  4.08 4.27  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1651  5.00  4.42  4.18 4.32  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69 4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2  1  2  4.00  955/1656  4.00  4.00  4.07 4.15  4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  723/1586  4.63  4.45  4.43 4.50  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  640/1585  4.88  4.69  4.69 4.79  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  496/1582  4.63  4.13  4.26 4.33  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  359/1575  4.75  4.23  4.27 4.30  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  399/1380  4.38  3.51  3.94 3.85  4.38

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86  955/1520  3.86  3.52  4.01 4.19  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  568/1515  4.57  3.76  4.24 4.47  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  458/1511  4.71  3.71  4.27 4.49  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  3  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  360/ 994  4.25  3.77  3.94 4.07  4.25

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  ****  3.52  4.23 4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 278  ****  3.15  4.19 4.42  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.40  4.46 4.67  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.65  4.33 4.66  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  ****  4.20 4.53  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 651  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1172
Title          OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM        Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    GULER, OSMAN                     Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  3               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR NA 1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   854/1674  4.33  4.07  4.27  4.44  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   379/1674  4.67  4.24  4.23  4.34  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   376/1423  4.67  4.38  4.27  4.28  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   490/1609  4.50  4.12  4.22  4.34  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   769/1585  4.00  3.88  3.96  4.23  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   238/1535  4.67  4.17  4.08  4.27  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   768/1651  4.33  4.42  4.18  4.32  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  1566/1673  4.00  4.74  4.69  4.78  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   257/1656  4.67  4.00  4.07  4.15  4.67

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  1300/1586  4.00  4.45  4.43  4.50  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  1129/1582  4.00  4.13  4.26  4.33  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   886/1575  4.33  4.23  4.27  4.30  4.33
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 688  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1173
Title       ABSTRACT ALGEBRA                    Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  TOLL, CHARLES                         Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires:  3                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.07  4.27  4.44  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.24  4.23  4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  376/1423  4.67  4.38  4.27  4.28  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1609  5.00  4.12  4.22  4.34  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  482/1585  4.33  3.88  3.96  4.23  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1535  5.00  4.17  4.08  4.27  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  330/1651  4.67  4.42  4.18  4.32  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1656  5.00  4.00  4.07  4.15  5.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1586  5.00  4.45  4.43  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1582  5.00  4.13  4.26  4.33  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1575  5.00  4.23  4.27  4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1380  5.00  3.51  3.94  3.85  5.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1520  5.00  3.52  4.01  4.19  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1515  5.00  3.76  4.24  4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1511  5.00  3.71  4.27  4.49  5.00


                                         Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 710A 0101             University of Maryland                      Page 1174
Title       ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS            Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS                Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   3   0   4  4.14 1075/1674  4.14  4.07  4.27  4.44  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   2   3  4.14 1043/1674  4.14  4.24  4.23  4.34  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   0   0   2   2  4.50  575/1423  4.50  4.38  4.27  4.28  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   2   3  4.14  985/1609  4.14  4.12  4.22  4.34  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  265/1585  4.60  3.88  3.96  4.23  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  200/1535  4.71  4.17  4.08  4.27  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   2   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  175/1651  4.80  4.42  4.18  4.32  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.74  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40  522/1656  4.40  4.00  4.07  4.15  4.40


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   4   2  4.14 1224/1586  4.14  4.45  4.43  4.50  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  748/1582  4.43  4.13  4.26  4.33  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   2   2   3  4.14 1060/1575  4.14  4.23  4.27  4.30  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  6   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1380  ****  3.51  3.94  3.85  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1520  ****  3.52  4.01  4.19  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1515  ****  3.76  4.24  4.47  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1511  ****  3.71  4.27  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.77  3.94  4.07  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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