Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: GAVREA, BOGDAN

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 32

Spring 2006

Page 942 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	0	0	_	_	7	11	1.0	2 70	1026/1401	2 72	4 00	4 00	4 1 4	2 70
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2 1	2 1	7 7	11 6	10 17		1236/1481	3.73	4.23	4.29	4.14	3.78 4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	7	17	4.16 4.23	917/1481 765/1249	4.04 4.07	4.17 4.39	4.23 4.27	4.18 4.14	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	7	3	7		1101/1424	3.92	4.14	4.27	4.14	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	5	10	8	4.00	707/1396	3.59	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	1	0	3	2	3		1039/1342	3.60	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	6	20	4.34	683/1459	4.09	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	863/1480	4.53	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	8	17			1156/1450			4.09	3.97	
Tarkuus														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	4	20	4.52	750/1409	3.90	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	6	6	15		1281/1407	4.29	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	12	13	4.24	837/1399	3.84	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	8	15	4.25	867/1400	4.02	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	560/1179		3.69	3.96		4.09
5. Did addiovisual econniques emanice your anderstanding	3	10	_	Ü	2	2	O	1.05	500/11/5	3.15	3.05	3.70	3.03	1.05
Discussion		_					_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	1	2	2	6		1059/1262		3.20	4.05	3.77	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	2	3	3	5		1071/1259	3.73	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	4	3	5		1055/1256	3.77	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/ 788	3.67	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	***	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: GAVREA, BOGDAN

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 942 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Title JONES CRISTEN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 943 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	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	5	7	8		1291/1481		4.23	4.29	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	9	9	3.92	1094/1481	4.04	4.17	4.23	4.18	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	2	11	9	3.92	962/1249	4.07	4.39	4.27	4.14	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	6	7	8	3.95	1023/1424	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.06	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	6	7	2	6	3.17	1234/1396	3.59	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	1	5	3	7	3.53	1106/1342	3.60	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	8	9	3.84	1094/1459	4.09	4.28	4.16	4.17	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	1185/1480	4.53	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	4	4	7	0	2.94	1373/1450	3.31	4.03	4.09	3.97	2.94
T. c. mb														
Lecture	0	0	5	4	4	2	0	2 20	1224/1400	2 00	4 40	4 40	1 20	2 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	-	-	_	-	4	3	9		1334/1409	3.90	4.40	4.42	4.36	3.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	11	12		1184/1407	4.29	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	10	4	7		1250/1399		4.05	4.26	4.23	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	4	10			1125/1400		4.18	4.27	4.19	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	7	0	4	4	4	2.89	1088/1179	3.49	3.69	3.96	3.85	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	2	7	5	3.65	940/1262	3.49	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	6	5	5		1017/1259	3.73	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	7	3	6		1016/1256		3.64	4.30	4.08	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	,			4.00	3.80	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	23	1	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 00		2.50	3.92	3.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	***	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4 48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
3. Here your concaces with the instructor herpful	47	U	J	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 31			1.03	1.00	

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: JONES CRISTEN

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 943 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 97
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 944 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	3	9	14	3.91	1162/1481	4.20	4.23	4.29	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	1	6	20	4.35	715/1481	4.60	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	5	21	4.31	695/1249	4.58	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	840/1424	4.39	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	1011/1396	3.92	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1039/1342	4.17	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	23	4.44	565/1459	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	30	4.88	743/1480	4.91	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	741/1450	4.32	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	7	19	4.45	839/1409	4.71	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	899/1407	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	3	7		4.04			4.05	4.26	4.23	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	3	5	16	4.14			4.18	4.27	4.19	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	23	1	2	0	1	1		****/1179		3.69	3.96	3.85	****
o. 21d dddio12bdd ocomingdob cimanoc 70di diacirodianding	3		_	_	Ü	_	_	2.00	,,		3.03	3.70	3.03	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	2	1	9	4		1052/1262		3.20	4.05	3.77	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	3	3	4	10	4.05	881/1259	4.24	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	2	3	5	6		1131/1256	3.89	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	13	16	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	3	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	2	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
	31	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.80	5.UU ****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 31			4.42		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor:

Enrollment: 97 Questionnaires: 33

Baltimore County BARADWAJ, RAJAL Spring 2006

Page 944 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA

Enrollment: 65 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 945

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	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	1	0	3	6	22	4.50	549/1481	4.20	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	155/1481	4.60	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	28	4.84	184/1249	4.58	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	326/1424	4.39	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	1	3	2	12	4.21	536/1396	3.92	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	190/1342	4.17	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	175/1459	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	491/1480	4.91	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	0	8	15	4.50	334/1450	4.32	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	75/1409	4.71	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	200/1407	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	195/1399	4.43	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	24	4.75	312/1400	4.45	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	15	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	510/1179	4.17	3.69	3.96	3.85	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	527/1262	3.83	3.20	4.05	3.77	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	0	4	13	4.42	661/1259	4.24	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	658/1256	3.89	3.64	4.30	4.08	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	13	12	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced				_	_	_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 33

RILEY, SAMANTHA 65

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 945 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 946

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 14 Stud	udent Course Evaluation Questionnaire	
-------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

Course-Section: MATH 115 0101

41

FINITE MATHEMATICS

GURTUNA, FILIZ

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

								_	ncies	3			tructor		-		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	947/1481	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.17
_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	1	0	2	4	5		1000/1481		4.17	4.23	4.18	4.00
		estions reflec			2	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	810/1249		4.39	4.27	4.14	4.17
	_	ations reflect		_	2	7	1	0	0	2	2		1160/1424		4.14	4.21	4.06	3.80
				what you learned	3	1	3	1	1	3	_		1292/1396		3.83	3.98	3.89	3.00
				o what you learned	4	5	2	0	1	1	1		1318/1342		4.07	4.07	3.88	2.80
		g system clearl			3	0	0	0	4	1	6		836/1459		4.28	4.16	4.17	4.18
		was class canc			4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	4	1	3.36	1277/1450	3.36	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.36
				3														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	1	1	1	0	8	4.18	1074/1409	4.18	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.18
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	xplained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1182/1399	3.70	4.05	4.26	4.23	3.70	
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	921/1400	4.18	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.18	
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	our understanding	3	6	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.69	3.96	3.85	4.00	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1087/1262	3.22	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.22
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	861/1259	4.11	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.11
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	2	0	0	0	7	4.11	854/1256	4.11	3.64	4.30	4.08	4.11
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		5	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
				Frequ	ency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	A 5		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 S	6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0		
28-55	2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	В 2						J						5		-
56-83	2	C 4		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14		
84-150	2	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2 1	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	_i h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5	-		5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MATH 132 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 947

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	225/1481	4.82	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.82
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	115/1481	4.91	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.91
3. Did th	ie exam qi	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.14	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.83
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0 1	6	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	592/1342	4.20	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.20
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1459	4.91	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.91
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectivenes:	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	196/1450	4.70	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.70
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture:	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.40	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.91
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.05	4.26	4.23	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.18	4.27	4.19	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	our understanding	0	5	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	739/1179	3.83	3.69	3.96	3.85	3.83	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	138/1262	4.88	3.20	4.05	3.77	4.88
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.88
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.64	4.30	4.08	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		3	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	159/ 788	4.57	3.41	4.00	3.80	4.57
				Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	3			Rea	ason	S			Тур	e			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 aior		0	Graduate	; 	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-1 ~ -1)	_	-	52 44440	-	-		_	ŭ
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-gr	ad 1	.1	Non-	major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 1													5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									response				_	•
				I 0		Other						.0	-		5			
				? 0							_	-						

PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Title Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment:

160 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 948 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	6	2	17	25	14		1324/1481		4.23	4.29	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	17	18	23		1148/1481	4.14	4.17	4.23	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	12	18	30	4.14	824/1249	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	39	2	2	8	6	7		1255/1424		4.14	4.21	4.06	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	23	3	5	13	12	7		1149/1396	3.58	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	40	2	4	6	5	7		1140/1342	3.78	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	7	12	39	4.27	766/1459	4.38	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	1	1	60	4.89	- ,	4.88	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	2	2	15	24	3	3.52	1216/1450	3.92	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	7	20	32	4.27	1019/1409	4.44	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	4	16	39		1145/1407	4.59	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	11	11	25	15		1196/1399	3.98	4.05	4.26	4.23	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	9	21	28		953/1400		4.18	4.27	4.19	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2.7	5	4	13	4	8		1019/1179		3.69	3.96		3.18
	_		_	_		_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	6	13	14	22	3.70	,		3.20	4.05	3.77	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	8	17	11	19		1092/1259	3.63	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	14	6	16	10	12		1167/1256	3.40	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	48	2	2	3	0	4	3.18	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	5	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	4	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar	<i>C</i> 1	2	0	0	^	0	2	г оо	++++/ (0	++++	4 00	4 40	4 54	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 68 ****/ 63	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	62	3	0	0	0	-	1	5.00	,		4.25	4.44	4.17	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	3	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	* * * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****
1 onded drough products for dri the beddenes	J 1	J	J	J	_	J	_	1.00	, 21			1.02	1.50	

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 160
Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 948 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	28	0.00-0.99	3	A	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	4	В	21						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	13	С	24	General	3	Under-grad	66	Non-major	66
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	41				
				?	3						

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment:

198 Questionnaires: 96 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 949 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
·														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	4	3	10	24	47	4.22	896/1481	3.91	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	3	0	9	21	54	4.41	646/1481	4.14	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	3	8	12	65	4.58	432/1249	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	45	0	0	5	15	22	4.40	557/1424	3.98	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	31	6	3	11	12	23	3.78	893/1396	3.58	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	51	0	1	11	8	17	4.11	695/1342	3.78	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	2	1	8	17	60	4.50	460/1459	4.38	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	3	81	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	2	1	5	28	36	4.32	567/1450	3.92	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	6	18	58	4.60	648/1409	4.44	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	0	5	9	67	4.72	899/1407	4.59	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	2	3	11	19	48	4.30	783/1399	3.98	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	2	1	9	11	59	4.51	581/1400	4.33	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	42	5	2	4	6	16	3.79	773/1179		3.69	3.96	3.85	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	14	5	17	10	25	2 20	1041/1262	3.54	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	5	11	10	16	29		1041/1202	3.63	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	6	5	15	17	29		1025/1256	3.40	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	26	51	1	2	5	3	8		****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
1. Were special techniques successful	20	31	_	2	J	J	O	3.19	/ /00		3.11	1.00	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	87	2	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	3	1	1	3	1	2.78	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	88	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	88	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	88	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	91	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	91	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	91	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	91	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	91	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	91	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	91	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	91	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	91	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	91	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	91	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	91	2	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****
1 disagn products for all one seadings		_	ŭ	J	~	Ü	_	3.07	, 21			1.02	1.55	

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 198
Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 949 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	30	0.00-0.99	0	 А	42	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	2	В	21						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	С	12	General	2	Under-grad	96	Non-major	96
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	13	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment:

47

Questionnaires: 28

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 950 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	0						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	549/1481	4.32	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.50
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	9	17	4.50	517/1481		4.17	4.23	4.18	4.50
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	548/1249	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.46
	_	ations reflect		_	0	11	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	933/1424	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.06
				what you learned	0	11	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	574/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.18
	_	_		o what you learned	1	10	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	683/1342	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.12
		system clearly			0	0	0	2	1	2	23	4.64	298/1459	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.64
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1480	4.64	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	445/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.42
		Lecture	_															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	319/1409	4.61	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.81
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear;					0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	785/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.78
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear and the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	431/1399	4.22	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.63
4. Did th	ne lecture	you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	18	4.56	541/1400	4.35	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.56		
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1179	3.74	3.69	3.96	3.85	****
	Discussion																	
				what you learned	3	0	10	4	5	4	2	2.36	1236/1262	2.79	3.20	4.05	3.77	2.36
				d to participate	2	0	5	8	5	4	4	2.77	1207/1259	3.31	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.77
				d open discussion	4	0	4	4	7	6	3		1167/1256		3.64	4.30	4.08	3.00
4. Were	special te	chniques succes	ssful		3	21	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
		Laborat	-															
		rease understar			24	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 246		****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were y	you provid	led with adequat	te back	ground information	25	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
		Semina	_							_								
1. Were a	assigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27							quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	:s	2	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55																		
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 8 C 3							1				0	Under-g	rad 2	28	Non-	-major	27
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 6 D 0																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	nt	
	P 0																	

Other

24

Ι

?

0

0

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 951 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	8	9		1069/1481			4.29	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	725/1481	4.38	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	810/1249	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	557/1424		4.14	4.21	4.06	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	707/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	755/1342		4.07	4.07	3.88	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	775/1459	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0 1	0	0	24	5.00	1/1480	4.64	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	Τ	Τ	3	10	8	4.00	836/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	648/1409	4.61	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	930/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	2	4	13	4.13	938/1399	4.22	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	3	13	4.09	988/1400	4.35	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	997/1179		3.69	3.96	3.85	3.25
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	7	3	1	2	2.14	1242/1262	2.79	3.20	4.05	3.77	2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	7	5	1	3	2.52	1225/1259	3.31	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	3	5	2	4	2.67	1212/1256	3.36	3.64	4.30	4.08	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	771/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	2.43
T . h h														
Laboratory	1.0	_	_	0	0	1	0	0 00	**** / 016	****		4 00	2 02	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	2	0	-	1	0		****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	2	0	0 1	1	0	0 1	1.50	****/ 249 ****/ 242	****	****	4.11	3.95 4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 242	****	****	4.40		****
-	20 20	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	3	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	~~~/ Z1/	***		4.04	4.02	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

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

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

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: HEINZ, FEDERICO

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 952

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	549/1481	4.32	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	617/1481	4.38	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	679/1249	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	437/1424	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	411/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 4	7	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	719/1342	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	890/1459	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	18	6	4.25	1215/1480	4.64	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 10	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	989/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.88
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	3	0	0	0	2	3	19		500/1409	4.61		4.42	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	18		1031/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	7	11		819/1399	4.22	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	531/1400	4.35	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	753/1179	3.74	3.69	3.96	3.85	3.82
Discussion			_		_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	4	3	5	5		1048/1262		3.20	4.05	3.77	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	4	5	4	5		1120/1259	3.31	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	988/1256	3.36	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	394/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 E0	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 249	***	****	4.20	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 249	***	****	4.11	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	24	_	U	U		U		4.00	/ 21/			4.04	4.02	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	****
The state of the s														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	***	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	***

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor:

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY
HEINZ, FEDERICO

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 952 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0401 Title

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: WILSON, MARY C

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 953 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equer	ncies	5		Inst	cructor	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	Λ	2	2	1	7	4 07	1031/1481	4.32	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	975/1481	4.38	4.17	4.23	4.14	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.00	893/1249	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	1	2	0	2		1207/1424	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.14	3.71
	1	8 5	0	1	0	2	3		1083/1396		3.83	3.98		3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	7	5	2							3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	_	Τ	2	0	2	Τ.		1269/1342		4.07	4.07	3.88	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	6	5		1125/1459		4.28	4.16	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	Ţ	0	0	0	0	2	13		756/1480		4.83	4.68	4.64	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	5	Τ	3	3.00	1354/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	6	5	3.80	1238/1409	4.61	4.40	4.42	4.36	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	1	11		1221/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	6	5	1		1312/1399		4.05	4.26	4.23	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	1	5	5		1240/1400	4.35	4.18	4.27	4.19	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	1	3	1		1027/1179		3.69	3.96	3.85	3.14
J. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding		O	2	U	_	J		3.11	102//11/9	3.71	3.05	3.90	3.03	J.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	4	0	1	1	1.73	1255/1262	2.79	3.20	4.05	3.77	1.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	7	2	2	2	2	2.33	1234/1259	3.31	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	3	2	2	2.47	1222/1256	3.36	3.64	4.30	4.08	2.47
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
Frequ	ency	Diet	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 954 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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	4	6	19	4.32	759/1481	4.32	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	22	4.58	422/1481	4.38	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	460/1249	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	406/1424	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	2	2	2	10	3.74	934/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	454/1342	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	10	19	4.52	448/1459	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	6	4.19	1260/1480	4.64	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	334/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	290/1409	4.61	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	804/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	9	18	4.43	648/1399	4.22	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	23	4.57	531/1400	4.35	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	712/1179	3.74	3.69	3.96	3.85	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	3	3	7	8	3.58	965/1262	2.79	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	7	12	4.21	816/1259	3.31	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	868/1256	3.36	3.64	4.30	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	701/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	3.18

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	2	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	1						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 19 (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 955

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestior	ne		MB	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	487/1481		4.23	4.29	4.14	4.58
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	632/1481		4.17	4.23	4.18	4.42
	_	estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	261/1249		4.39	4.27	4.14	4.74
		ations reflect			0	7	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	740/1424		4.14	4.21	4.06	4.25
	_	-		what you learned	0	6	3	1	4	1	4		1245/1396		3.83	3.98	3.89	3.15
				o what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	542/1342		4.07	4.07	3.88	4.25
		system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	310/1459		4.28	4.16	4.17	4.63
	_	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	11	8		1100/1480		4.83	4.68	4.64	4.42
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	all teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	89/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.96
		Lectur											004/440					
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	304/1409		4.40	4.42	4.36	4.82
		tor seem inter		_	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	568/1407		4.70	4.69	4.57	4.88
		_		xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	203/1399		4.05	4.26	4.23	4.81
		s contribute t		-	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	177/1400		4.18	4.27	4.19	4.64
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques er	nhance y	our understanding	3	8	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	197/1179	3.74	3.69	3.96	3.85	4.63
		Discus			_			_										
				what you learned	5	0	4	1	3	2	4		1137/1262		3.20	4.05	3.77	3.07
				d to participate	5	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	961/1259		3.65	4.29	4.06	3.93
		_		d open discussion	5	0	3	1	1	5	4		1120/1256		3.64	4.30	4.08	3.43
. were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	essiui		6	8	U	0	2	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	4.00
1 544 - 64	. 1-1	Labora	_	£ the metalial	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246		++++	4 20	2 02	++++
				f the material ground information	17	1 0	0	0	0	0	0 1	5.00	****/ 246 ****/ 249		++++	4.20	3.93	****
_	-	structor provid		9	18 18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240		****	4.11	4.20	***
		_											,					
		Field				_		_	_	_								
				hat you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59		5.00	4.30	4.00	****
-	-	-		uation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	=	****	4.00	3.44	****
		tor available			18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36		****	4.60	5.00	****
	_	could you disc	_	r evaluations ield activities	18 18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41 ****/ 31		****	4.26	****	****
J. 214 001	01 0110 02	, help you call	., 040 1					-		Ü	_	3.00	, 31	•				
				Frequ	lency	DIS	LTID	ucio	[]									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	5
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В 7				_				_	_					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	grad :	19	Non-	-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 1		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -					gh
				P 0								_	respons	ses to 1	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot]	her				1	.8						
				? 0														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 956 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	u dain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	487/148	L 4.32	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.58
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	632/148		4.17	4.23	4.18	4.42
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	261/124		4.39	4.27	4.14	4.74
		ations reflect			0	7	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	740/142		4.14	4.21	4.06	4.25
			-	what you learned	0	6	3	1	4	1	4		1245/139		3.83	3.98	3.89	3.15
	_	-		what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	542/134		4.07	4.07	3.88	4.25
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	310/145		4.28	4.16	4.17	4.63
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	11	8		1100/148		4.83	4.68	4.64	4.42
				ning effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/145		4.03	4.09	3.97	4.96
		T	_															
1 1/2 +1	h	Lectur			1 -	0	0	0	0	0	4	F 00	++++/1/0	1 (1	4 40	4 40	1 20	4 00
		ctor's lecture tor seem inter			15	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/140		4.40	4.42	4.36	4.82
					15	-	0	0	0	-	4		****/140		4.70		4.57	4.88
		_		xplained clearly	15	0	0	1	0	0	4		****/139		4.05	4.26	4.23	4.81
		s contribute t		-	14	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.40	704/140		4.18	4.27	4.19	4.64
5. Did au	alovisual	tecnniques en	nance yo	our understanding	14	2	U	U	U	Τ	2	4.6/	****/117	3.74	3.69	3.96	3.85	4.63
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	5	0	4	1	3	2	4	3.07	1137/126	2.79	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.07
				d to participate	5	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	961/125	3.31	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.93
				d open discussion	5	0	3	1	1	5	4		1120/125		3.64	4.30	4.08	3.43
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	8	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	394/ 78	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	4.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding of	f the material	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	5 ****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were ye	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
		Field	Work															
1 Did fi	eld exper			nat you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 5) ****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
				uation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 5		****	4.00	3.44	****
		tor available			18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3		****	4.60	5.00	****
		could you disc			18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4	-	****	4.26	****	****
				ield activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	_	****	4.42	***	****
				Frequ	onat	Dia	t will be	1+101	2									
				riequ	lency	DISI	CLID	ucioi	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			T	/pe			Majors	5
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	 Gradua	 :e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	в 7						J						5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-	grad :	19	Non-	-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 1										-			_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 1		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respon	ses to 1	oe sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.8						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0701 University of Maryland Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: WILSON, MARY C Enrollment: 43

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 957 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk	ills fro	m this course	0	0	0	2	7	9	11	4.00	1069/1481	4.32	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.00
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor make clea:	r the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	14	4.28	801/1481	4.38	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.28
3. Did tl	he exam q	uestions refle	ct the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	3	5	10	10	3.96	927/1249	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.14	3.96
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	12	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1101/1424	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.06	3.88
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contril	bute to	what you learned	0	12	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	763/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.94
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments cont	ribute t	o what you learned	0	13	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	672/1342	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.13
7. Was tl	he grading	g system clear	ly expla	ined	0	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	719/1459	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.31
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1480	4.64	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How we	ould you	grade the over	all tead	hing effectiveness	4	2	3	0	4	9	7	3.74	1115/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.74
		Lectu	re															
1 Were	the instri	uctor's lectur		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	8	19	4 70	500/1409	4 61	4 40	4 42	4.36	4 70
		ctor seem inte			1	0	0	0	2	4	22		899/1407	4.68	4.70		4.57	
				explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5			4.11		4.22	4.05		4.23	
		es contribute			1	0	1	1	1				867/1400		4.18			4.25
				our understanding		20	1	0		1			****/1179					****
5. DIG a	uaiovisua.	r techniques e.	illiance y	our understanding	2	20	1	U	1	T	4	4.00	/11/9	3.74	3.09	3.90	3.05	
		Discu																
				what you learned	0	0		4	6	3			1158/1262		3.20		3.77	
				d to participate	1	0	5	3	6				1128/1259	3.31		4.29	4.06	3.39
		_		d open discussion	2	0	2	2	3	9			967/1256		3.64		4.08	3.93
4. Were	special to	echniques succ	essful		2	22	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	 11	0.00.0.00																
00-27 28-55	5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 6 B 12		Ke	quire	eu I	٦r. M	a jor	5	4	Graduat	E	0	Majo)T	3
28-55 56-83	5 4	2.00-2.99	0 5			0	nera:	1				0	Under-q	~~d ~	19	Moss	ma i a	26
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	10	C 8		Ge	nera.	L				U	under-g	rau 2	3	Non-	-major	26
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	D 0 F 1		רק.	ectiv	70.0				0	#### - 1	Moona +	horo a	vo not	ono	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		E1	ECLT,	ves				U					_	11
				= *		0+1	h				_	7	respons	es to L	e sign	iiiicai	IL	
				I 0		Ut.	her				2	7						
				? 2														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 958 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eva	luation Qu	uesti	.onnai	ire
--------------------	------------	-------	--------	-----

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	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	3	10	18	4.33	749/1481		4.23	4.29	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	19	4.55	469/1481	4.65	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	24	4.64	369/1249	4.70	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	762/1424		4.14	4.21	4.06	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	707/1396	3.99	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	303/1342	4.37	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	22	4.55	413/1459		4.28	4.16	4.17	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	743/1480	4.97	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	334/1450	4.62	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.50
Lecture	1	0	0	0	_	-	0.0	1	E74/1400	4 75	4 40	4 40	1 26	1
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7 8	23	4.66	574/1409	4.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1 0	4	8	19 22	4.41	1184/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69 4.26	4.57	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1 1	1	0	1	2 1	5	24	4.63	431/1399 409/1400	4.60 4.70	4.05 4.18	4.26	4.23 4.19	4.63 4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	780/1179	3.70	3.69	3.96		3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	4	U	U	3	4	3.70	/60/11/9	3.70	3.09	3.90	3.03	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	5	5	3	8	2 93	1167/1262	3.24	3.20	4.05	3.77	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	10	2	5	5	6		1196/1259	3.48	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	8	4	3	6	7		1167/1256	3.65	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	24	1	0	0	1	2		****/ 788	2.97	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
i. Neie bpecial ceciniques successiui	3		_	0	Ü	_	_	3.73	, , , , ,	2.57	3.11	1.00	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced					_	_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	***

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 62
Questionnaires: 33

JOWIKOWSKI, WI 52 Page 958 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	С	8	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0201 University of Maryland Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY Baltimore County Instructor:

TIGHE, BONNY (Instr. A) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 49

Questionnaires: 35 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	ills fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	4	10	20	4.40	678/1481	4.49	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.40
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	6	25	4.60	399/1481	4.65	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.60
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	ct the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	310/1249	4.70	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.69
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	15	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	684/1424	4.36	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.30
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	11	0	1	7	7	9	4.00	707/1396	3.99	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	0	15	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	638/1342	4.37	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.15
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	7	28	4.80	161/1459	4.68	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	1	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	all teac	hing effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	210/1450	4.62	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.75
		Lectur	~e															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	nrenared	Ω	0	0	0	1	9	25	4.69	529/1409	4.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.69
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	545/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.89
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	11	22	4.57	491/1399	4.60	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.59
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	2	5	28	4.74	324/1400		4.18	4.27	4.19	4.82
				our understanding	1		1	0	1	2	5	4.11	549/1179		3.69			4.11
J. Dia aa	arovibaa.	r cccimitqueb ci	mance j	our unacrocanaring	_	23	-	Ü	_	_	3		313/11/3	3.70	3.03	3.50	3.03	
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	6	0	3	4	6	8	8	3.48	1002/1262	3.24	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.48
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively er	ncourage	d to participate	6	0	0	4	5	6	14	4.03	886/1259	3.48	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.03
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	1	5	10	13	4.21	804/1256	3.65	3.64	4.30	4.08	4.21
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		7	19	2	1	5	0	1	2.67	749/ 788	2.97	3.41	4.00	3.80	2.67
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	\	Expected Grades				Pos	ason	c			Ту	00			Majors	
E			·											pe 				,
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 8		Gei	nera	l				5	Under-g	rad 3	35	Non-	-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				2	25						
				? 3														

Page 959

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MATH 152 0201 University of Maryland Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY TIGHE, BONNY

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 960

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 35

Instructor:

- · ·	_			
Student	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollegtion	nnaire

					Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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	v insights, skills from this cours	е	0	0	0	1	4	10	20	4.40	678/1481	4.49	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.4
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	4	6	25	4.60	399/1481	4.65	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.6
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the expected goals	s	0	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	310/1249	4.70	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.6
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the expected goals		0	15	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	684/1424	4.36	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.3
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to what you lea:	rned	0	11	0	1	7	7	9	4.00	707/1396	3.99	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.0
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute to what you le	earned	0	15	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	638/1342	4.37	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.1
7. Was the grading	system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	0	7	28	4.80	161/1459	4.68	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.8
8. How many times w	was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.0
9. How would you gr	rade the overall teaching effecti	veness	24	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	135/1450	4.62	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.7
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	ctor's lectures well prepared		25	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.6
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested in the subject	t	25	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.8
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and explained clea	arly	25	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.5
4. Did the lectures	s contribute to what you learned		25	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	146/1400	4.70	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.8
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understa	nding	26	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1179	3.70	3.69	3.96	3.85	4.
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to what you lea:	rned	6	0	3	4	6	8	8	3.48	1002/1262	3.24	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.4
2. Were all student	s actively encouraged to partici	pate	6	0	0	4	5	6	14	4.03	886/1259	3.48	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.0
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair and open discu	ssion	6	0	0	1	5	10	13	4.21	804/1256	3.65	3.64	4.30	4.08	4.2
4. Were special ted	chniques successful		7	19	2	1	5	0	1	2.67	749/ 788	2.97	3.41	4.00	3.80	2.6
		Freque	ncy	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected	Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 7	0.00-0.99 0 A 1	2				ed fo	 วะ M	aior		 2	Graduat		0	Maio		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	35	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
				2	3						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 32

POOR, JAGMOHA

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 961 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		MD	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General															
	ew insights,skills fr		0	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	373/1481		4.23	4.29	4.14	4.69
	ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	115/1481	4.65	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.91
	uestions reflect the	_	0	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	99/1249		4.39	4.27	4.14	4.94
	uations reflect the e	_	0	15	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	302/1424		4.14	4.21	4.06	4.65
_	eadings contribute to signments contribute	_	0 1	14 17	2 0	3	2	3	8 12	3.67 4.86	985/1396 99/1342		3.83	3.98 4.07	3.89	3.67 4.86
	g system clearly expl	-	0	1 /	0	0	4	4	24	4.88	321/1459		4.07	4.07	4.17	4.86
_	was class cancelled	aineu	0	1	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1480			4.68		5.00
	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	,		4.03	4.09	3.97	4.65
J. How would you	grade the overall tea	ciring cricectveness	Ü	J	Ü	Ü	-	,	10	1.05	221/1130	1.02	1.03	1.05	3.77	1.05
	Lecture															
	uctor's lectures well		1	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	231/1409		4.40	4.42	4.36	4.87
	ctor seem interested		1	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	728/1407		4.70	4.69	4.57	4.81
	terial presented and	-	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	322/1399	4.60	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.71
	es contribute to what	-	2	0	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	385/1400		4.18	4.27	4.19	4.70
5. Did audiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	2	17	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	590/1179	3.70	3.69	3.96	3.85	4.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	7	0	11	2	4	2	6	2.60	1213/1262	3.24	3.20	4.05	3.77	2.60
	nts actively encourage	-	8	0	9	1	5	2	7		1190/1259		3.65	4.29	4.06	2.88
	ctor encourage fair a		11	0	7	3	5	0	6	2.76	1205/1256	3.65	3.64	4.30	4.08	2.76
4. Were special t	echniques successful	_	8	19	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 788	2.97	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
	Laboratory															
1 Did the lah in	crease understanding	of the material	28	3	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
	ded with adequate bac		28	0	3	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
	materials available		28	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
-	structor provide assi		28	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
	nts for lab reports c		28	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	***	****	4.04	4.02	***
1 5/4 6/-14	Field Work	. la . b	0.0	_	2	0	0	^	_	1 00	****/ FO		F 00	4 20	4 00	****
_	rience contribute to	_	29 29	0	3 3	0	0	0	0		****/ 59 ****/ 51	****	5.00	4.30	4.00 3.44	****
2. Did you cleari	y understand your eva	Iuation Criteria	29	U	3	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 51			4.00	3.44	
	Self Paced															
 Did self-paced 	system contribute to	what you learned	29	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
		Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio:	n									
		_	-													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 8	0.00-0.99 0	A 18		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 7	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		C -	m o m =	1				2	IIndor	~~d ~	2.2	No-	mo i o	2.0
56-83 6 84-150 1	2.00-2.99 4 3.00-3.49 5	C 4 D 0		GE	nera	т				2	Under-g	rau 3	32	non-	-major	32
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 12	F 1		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
		P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
		I 0		Ot	her				2	!5						
		? 0														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 962 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		 General															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,skills fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	395/1481	4.49	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.67
		ctor make clear the ex		1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	135/1481	4.65	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.88
		uestions reflect the e	_	1	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	287/1249		4.39	4.27	4.14	4.71
		uations reflect the ex		1	7	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	473/1424	4.36	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.47
		eadings contribute to		1	17	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1396	3.99	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.43
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contribute to	what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	251/1342	4.37	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.58
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	390/1459	4.68	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.56
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.83	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall teac	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	231/1450	4.62	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.65
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well :	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	217/1409	4.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.88
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem interested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	636/1407	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.84
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.60
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	361/1400	4.70	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.72
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	14	1	1	7	2	0	2.91	1087/1179	3.70	3.69	3.96	3.85	2.91
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	5	0	3	1	5	7	4	3.40	1034/1262	3.24	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.40
2. Were a	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1002/1259	3.48	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.85
3. Did the	ne instru	ctor encourage fair and	d open discussion	7	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1012/1256	3.65	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.83
4. Were s	special to	echniques successful		6	7	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	588/ 788	2.97	3.41	4.00	3.80	3.58
		Laboratory															
1. Did the	ne lab in	crease understanding o	f the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate back	ground information	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were n	necessary	materials available f	or lab activities	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provide assis	cance	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant to the	announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	:			Ту	ne			Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 0	A 12 B 10		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0			a		1				^	TT		٠.	Man		٥٢
56-83 84-150	1 1	2.00-2.99 3 3.00-3.49 5	C 3 D 0		Ge	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rau z	25	NON-	major	25
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0					TO 3	ecti					1	#### - :	Moana +	horo -	.xo xo+	ono	h
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0 P 0					E1	ECLI	ves				1	respons				_	11
			I O		O+1	her				2	1	respons	co LU L	e sign	ııııdı	10	
			5 U		UL.	TIET				2	_						
			. 0														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 77
Questionnaires: 38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 963 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			-				Course	_			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	11	2.2	4.45	626/1481	4.49	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	11	22	4.39	671/1481	4.65	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	27	4.53	479/1249	4.70	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	829/1424	4.36	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	2	6	3	7	3.83	854/1396	3.99	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	5	9	5	4.00	755/1342	4.37	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	29	4.74	210/1459	4.68	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	211/1480	4.97	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	14	17	4.39	483/1450	4.62	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	6	31		450/1409		4.40	4.42	4.36	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	3	5	28		1091/1407		4.70	4.69	4.57	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	10	24	4.47	601/1399		4.05	4.26	4.23	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	27	4.47	. ,		4.18	4.27	4.19	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	33	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1179	3.70	3.69	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	Λ	0	3	3	11	13	8	3 53	987/1262	3.24	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	5	10	11	7		1143/1259	3.48	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	9	9	14		1000/1256	3.46	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	37	0	0	0	1	1.4		****/ 788		3.41	4.00	3.80	****
1. Were special techniques succession	U	51	U	U	U		U	1.00	, , , , ,	2.51	3.11	1.00	3.00	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	Λ	1 00	****/ 55	****	****	1 55	4.48	****
1. Did beil-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	U	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 55			4.33	4.48	
Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	n									
11040														

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	2	 Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	В	16						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	36
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0101 ELEMENTARY CALCULUS Baltimore County Instructor: ALLEN, KEVIN P

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

42

University of Maryland Spring 2006

Page 964

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluatio	n Questionnaire
---------	--------	-----------	-----------------

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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	1	11	11	4.16	947/1481	3.40	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	14	4.32	747/1481	3.39	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	12	4.04	877/1249	3.45	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1170/1424	3.17	4.14	4.21	4.06	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	675/1396	3.65	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	934/1342	3.15	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	535/1459	3.84	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	351/1480	4.98	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1142/1450	2.81	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	Ω	Λ	Λ	1	5	18	4.71	500/1409	3.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	952/1407	4.06	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	8	14	4.32	763/1399		4.05	4.26	4.23	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	9	14	4.40	704/1400		4.18	4.27	4.19	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	419/1179		3.69	3.96		4.29
5. Fix audiovipual deciminques cimanos four anacistanding	Ü		Ü	_	_	Ü		1.27	110,111	1.25	3.03	3.70	3.03	1.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1262	1.11	3.20	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1259	1.94	3.65	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1256	1.39	3.64	4.30	4.08	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201 University of Maryland
Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS Baltimore County
Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

86

University of Maryland Page 965
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	ouestronnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u dain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	6	6	10	4	2	2 64	1475/1481	3.40	4.23	4.29	4.14	2.64
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	7	9	6	4	2		1472/1481	3.39	4.17	4.23	4.18	2.46
		uestions reflec		_	1	0	7	5	6	5	5		1210/1249		4.39	4.27	4.14	2.86
	_	uations reflect			1	12	6	1	5	2	2		1410/1424		4.14	4.21	4.06	2.56
				what you learned	3	10	3	1	3	7	2		1199/1396		3.83	3.98	3.89	3.25
	_	_		o what you learned	1		6	0	3	3	1		1328/1342		4.07	4.07	3.88	2.46
		g system clearl		_	1	0	5	6	2	0	7		1345/1459		4.28	4.16	4.17	3.21
		was class canc		iiiied	1	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1480		4.83	4.68	4.64	
	-			hing effectiveness	5	1	12	3	6	2	0		1445/1450		4.03	4.00		1.91
9. HOW WOL	uia you g	grade the overa	II tead	ming effectiveness	Э	Τ	12	3	О	2	U	1.91	1445/1450	2.81	4.03	4.09	3.97	1.91
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	8	4	7	4	5	2.79	1385/1409	3.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	2.79
		ctor seem inter			2	0	3	6	4	4	10		1376/1407		4.70	4.69	4.57	3.44
				explained clearly	1	0	13	6	6	3	0		1397/1399		4.05	4.26	4.23	1.96
		es contribute t			1	1	1.3	4	6	3	1		1391/1400		4.18	4.27	4.19	2.07
				our understanding	2	23	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1179	4.29	3.69	3.96	3.85	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	11	0	16	2	0	0	0		1259/1262		3.20	4.05	3.77	1.11
				ed to participate	11	0	8	5	4	0	1		1250/1259		3.65	4.29	4.06	1.94
		_		d open discussion	11	0	11	7	0	0	0		1253/1256		3.64	4.30	4.08	1.39
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		10	18	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
				1														
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	 auir	 ed f	or Ma	aiors	 3	5	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			1					-	- 210101010	-	-	5		-
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 11		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	19	Non-	major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 2		-						-	9		-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 3		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
	-			P 0		-							respons				_	•
				I O		Ot	her				2	2	-		3			

? 1

Course-Section: MATH 215 0201 University of Maryland Title

FINITE MATH FOR INFO S Baltimore County

Instructor: WANG, DAN

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 966 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

	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	8	7	4.22	883/1481	4.22	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	603/1481	4.44	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	228/1249	4.78	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	509/1424	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	233/1396	4.62	3.83	3.98	3.94	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	424/1342	4.38	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	332/1459	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	7	3	3.81	1046/1450	3.81	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1061/1407	4.56	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	819/1399	4.27	4.05	4.26	4.29	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	816/1400	4.31	4.18	4.27	4.34	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	487/1179	4.20	3.69	3.96	4.05	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1245/1262	2.00	3.20	4.05	4.11	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.64	4.30	4.28	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR Baltimore County
Instructor: HOFFMAN, KATHLE Spring 2006

Enrollment:

47

University of Maryland Page 967
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	30	Student Cou	urse Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	-------------	-----------------	---------------

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	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	6	13	11	4.17	947/1481	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	14	9	4.03	987/1481	3.98	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	624/1249	4.19	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	6	- 8	4.17	840/1424	3.87	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	1	6	3	7	3.78	901/1396	3.95	3.83	3.98	3.94	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	871/1342	3.88	4.07	4.07	4.05	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	19	4.40	611/1459	4.34	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	14	4.45	1086/1480	4.86	4.83	4.68	4.68	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	786/1450	3.85	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	705/1409	4.31	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	728/1407	4.78	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	6	8	11	3.90	1100/1399	3.77	4.05	4.26	4.29	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	5	6	15	4.07	997/1400	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.34	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/1179	3.23	3.69	3.96	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	816/1262	3.28	3.20	4.05	4.11	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	3	2		****/1259	3.08	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	2	3		****/1256		3.64	4.30	4.28	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 25

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 968 JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	_	_	_	_	2 04	1100/1401	4 7 4	4 00	4 00	4 40	2 04
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	-7	9	7		1199/1481	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.40	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	3	7	11	4		1264/1481	3.98	4.17	4.23	4.29	3.64
 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	1	2	7	10	5	3.64	1086/1249	4.19	4.39	4.27	4.36	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	2	6	8	1	3.47	1281/1424	3.87	4.14	4.21	4.28	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned			1	2	5	5	6	3.68	972/1396	3.95	3.83	3.98	3.94	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	1	4	5	3.57	1084/1342	3.88	4.07	4.07	4.05	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	5	10	4.00	961/1459	4.34	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1480	4.86	4.83	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	4	10	10	0	3.25	1307/1450	3.85	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Λ	1	10	7	7	3 80	1238/1409	4.31	4.40	4.42	4.47	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	952/1407	4.78	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	8	7	1/		1288/1399	3.77	4.70	4.26	4.29	3.28
			_	_	•	,	4		,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	6	5	5		1308/1400		4.18	4.27	4.34	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	8	2	6	2	5	2.74	1106/1179	3.23	3.69	3.96	4.05	2.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	3	5	3	0	2.69	1203/1262	3.28	3.20	4.05	4.11	2.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	4	3	3	2	3.08	1159/1259	3.08	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	967/1256		3.64	4.30	4.28	3.92
1. III III III III III III III III III I		•	-	_	_	-	_		,					

Frequency Distribution

12 4 4 1 3 1 0 2.11 780/ 788 2.11 3.41 4.00 3.98 2.11

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	10							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	2							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0 Electives		6	#### - Means	are not enough	enough		
				P	0		responses to		be sig	be significant		
				I	0	Other	18	_				
				?	2							

Course-Section: MATH 221 0301 University of Maryland
Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR Baltimore County

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 42

Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 969

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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		rom this sourse	0	0	Λ	2	5	6	0	2 05	1115/1481	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.40	3.95
2. Did the instructo	J ,		0	0	0	2	6	5	0		1118/1481	3.98	4.23	4.23	4.29	3.90
3. Did the exam ques			0	0	0	1	5	2	12	4.24	757/1249	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.36	4.24
4. Did other evaluat		=	0	8	1	0	4	2	6		1061/1424	3.87	4.14	4.21	4.28	3.92
5. Did assigned read		1 3	0	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	707/1396	3.95	3.83	3.98	3.94	4.00
9	9	to what you learned	0	8	1	1	3	2	8 6	3.85	927/1342	3.95	4.07	4.07	4.05	3.85
		-		0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	436/1459	4.34	4.07	4.07		4.52
7. Was the grading s		lained	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1480		4.28	4.16	4.17 4.68	5.00
8. How many times wa			0 5	0	0	1	6	0	21		,	4.86				
9. How would you gra	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiv					Τ	ь	5	4	3./5	1098/1450	3.85	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.75
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					2	3	4	12	4.24	1043/1409	4.31	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.24
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	804/1407	4.78	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.76
3. Was lecture mater		•	1	0	1	2	6	3	8		1163/1399	3.77	4.05	4.26	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures	-		0	0	2	0	7	5	7		1165/1400	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual t		-	1	16	٥	n	n	0	4		****/1179		3.69	3.96	4.05	****
J. Dia addiovibuai e	cenniques ennance	your understanding	_	10	U	U	O	U	1	3.00	/ 11/2	3.23	3.05	3.70	1.03	
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss		o what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1262	3.28	3.20	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students		-	17	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1259		3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructo		17	0	1	0	0	1	2		****/1256		3.64	4.30	4.28	****	
3. Dia dia imperate	and open arboabbien		ŭ	_	ŭ	Ü	_	_	3.75	, 1230	3.72	3.01	1.50	1.20		
	Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n										
Condity Boomed	undity Harried Com CDA Harried Co							_			m				M	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty]	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0401 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 970

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

LO, JAMES T

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	450/1481	4.14	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.62
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	736/1481		4.17	4.23	4.29	4.33
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	535/1249	4.19	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.48
		uations reflect			1	8	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1074/1424	3.87	4.14	4.21	4.28	3.92
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	435/1396	3.95	3.83	3.98	3.94	4.33
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	603/1342	3.88	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.19
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	580/1459	4.34	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.86	4.83	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	588/1450	3.85	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.29
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	603/1409	4.31	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.63		
		n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	522/1407		4.70	4.69	4.78	4.89		
		explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	920/1399		4.05	4.26	4.29	4.16		
		es contribute t			2	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	859/1400		4.18	4.27	4.34	4.26
				our understanding	2	12	0	2	1	1	3		820/1179		3.69	3.96		3.71
		Discus																
1 Did al	aga diga			what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	0	2	2 50	****/1262	2 20	3.20	4 05	4.11	****
				ed to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1259		3.65	4.29	4.34	****
				nd open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/1256				4.28	****
		echniques succe		ia open arbeassion	17	3	0	0	1	0			****/ 788				3.98	****
				_														
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utioi	า									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55						2.00			10		-	-	or addae	-	-		_	5
56-83						Gei	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	21	Non-	major	18
84-150													5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Otl	ner				1	.8	_					

Course-Section: MATH 221H 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO LINEAR ALGEBRA

Instructor:

ZWECK, JOHN

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 971

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 14

	Questions				170	3.7.7		_	ncies	5	-		ructor		_		Level	
		Question	s 		NR	NA		2	3	- 4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	d you gain	new insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.40	5.00
		uctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.50
3. Did	d the exam	questions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	219/1249	4.79	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.79
4. Did	d other eva	luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.50
5. Did	d assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	3	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.46	3.83	3.98	3.94	3.46
6. Did	d written a	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	405/1342	4.40	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.40
7. Was	s the gradi	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How	w many time	s was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.83	4.68	4.68	4.93
9. How	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	389/1450	4.46	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.46
1 Wow	Lecture re the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	2	1	11	1 61	588/1409	1 61	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.64
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	7	12		614/1407		4.70	4.42	4.47	4.86
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	4	2	6				4.05	4.26	4.78	4.17
	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64				4.27	4.34	
				our understanding	0	9	0	1	1	1	-		760/1179			3.96	4.05	
J. DIC	audiovisu	ar ceciminques en	nance y	our understanding	U	,	U	1	1		2	3.00	700/1179	3.00	3.09	3.90	4.05	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	d class dis	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.20	4.05	4.11	3.83
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259		3.65	4.29	4.34	
		_		d open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	3.64	4.30	4.28	3.50
4. Wer	re special	techniques succe	ssful		8	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ıtioı	ı									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	7 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	5 8	1.00-1.99	0	в 7						-						_		
56-83						Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	8
84-15																		
Grad.						Ele	ecti	res				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	1						
				? 1														

Course-Section: MATH 225 0101

Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 43

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 972 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	om this course	5	0	0	2	4	11	21	4.34	739/1481	4.31	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.34
		ctor make clear the ex		5	0	0	1	2	13	22	4.47	560/1481		4.17	4.23	4.29	4.47
		uestions reflect the e		5	0	0	0	4	10	24	4.53	479/1249		4.39	4.27	4.36	4.53
	_	uations reflect the ex	_	5	16	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	497/1424	4.37	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.45
		eadings contribute to		5	14	2	2	5	5	10	3.79	885/1396		3.83	3.98	3.94	3.79
		signments contribute t		5	18	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	364/1342	4.46	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.45
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly expla	ined	5	0	0	0	1	10	27	4.68	253/1459	4.62	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.68
8. How m	many times	was class cancelled		5	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How w	vould you	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	6	14	13	4.21	672/1450	3.99	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.21
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instru	uctor's lectures well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	7	31	4.82	319/1409	4.68	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.82
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem interested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	9	29	4.76	804/1407	4.65	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.76
		terial presented and ϵ		5	0	0	0	2	13	23	4.55	513/1399	4.03	4.05	4.26	4.29	4.55
4. Did t	the lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	5	0	1	1	4	8	24	4.39	716/1400	4.10	4.18	4.27	4.34	4.39
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	5	30	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	****/1179	****	3.69	3.96	4.05	****
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to		34	0	2	2	1	1	3		****/1262		3.20	4.05	4.11	****
		nts actively encourage		33	0	1	0	2	3	4		****/1259		3.65	4.29		****
		ctor encourage fair ar	nd open discussion	33	0	0	1	1	3	5		****/1256		3.64	4.30		****
4. Were	special te	echniques successful		33	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****
		Field Work															
1. Did f	field exper	rience contribute to v	hat you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
		Self Paced															
		system contribute to		42	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	,		****	4.55	4.44	****
		tions make clear the e		42	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31		****	4.75	4.50	****
		acts with the instruct		42	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51		****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was t	the feedbac	ck/tutoring by proctor	s helpful	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	: ****	****	4.83	4.43	****
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			ТΣ	рe			Majors	;	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 14		Red	 guir	ed f	 or M	 lajor	 s	0	 Graduat	.e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 12								-		-	-	,	-	-
56-83	10	C 10		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-c	rad 4	:3	Non-	-major	40	
84-150	5	2.00-2.99 4 3.00-3.49 7	D 0									_				3 - 1	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ιh
			Р 0										es to b			_	
			- ·		0+1					_				J-			

Other

33

I

?

0

Course-Section: MATH 225 0201

Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 973 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

		Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1152/1481	4.31	4.23	4.29	4.40	3.92
0	0	1	1	4	1	5		- , -				4.29	3.67
0	0	0	4	0	3	5			4.31	4.39	4.27	4.36	3.75
1	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	959/1424	4.37	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.00
0	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	918/1396	4.01	3.83	3.98	3.94	3.75
0	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	542/1342	4.46	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.25
1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	535/1459	4.62	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.45
0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.68	5.00
3	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1354/1450	3.99	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.00
1	٥	Λ	Λ	2	2	6	1 26	025/1/00	1 60	4 40	1 12	1 17	4.36
1	-	•	-		-	-		,					4.36
_	-	-				1							2.82
						2							3.17
	-	0	1	0	0	0		. ,	****				****
Ū		Ü	_	ŭ	Ü		2.00	,		3.05	3.50	1.05	
6	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1186/1262	2.83	3.20	4.05	4.11	2.83
6	0	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	1234/1259	2.33	3.65	4.29	4.34	2.33
7	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1246/1256	2.00	3.64	4.30	4.28	2.00
7	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****
11	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	++++/ 016	++++	++++	4 20	4 [1	****
	-	•	-	1	•	Τ		,					****
	-	-	-	υ Τ	-	1		,					****
	-				-	1		,					***
	-	-		0	•	1		,					****
тт	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ ZI/			4.04	4.40	
	0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 3	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 0 8 0 8 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 1	NR NA 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 8 0 1 4 0 0 8 0 1 0 0 0 3 0 2 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 0	NR NA 1 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 1 4 0 0 0 8 0 1 0 8 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 2 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 2 2 0 0 1 4 0 11 0 1 6 0 2 0 6 0 2 0 7 0 2 1 7 4 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 11 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 0 0 0 0 2 0 8 0 1 1 0 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2 1 5 0 0 1 1 4 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 4 0 0 2 3 0 8 0 1 1 0 0 8 0 0 0 3 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 0 2 0 2 1 2 0 7 4 0 0 1 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4 0 0 1 1 4 1 5 0 0 0 4 0 3 5 1 4 0 0 2 3 2 0 8 0 1 1 0 2 0 8 0 1 1 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 3 0 2 1 3 1 2 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 1 0 0 2 2 4 2 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 6 0 2 0 2 1 1 6 0 2 0 4 0 0 7 0 2 1 2 0 0 7 4 0 0 1 0 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4 3.92 0 0 1 1 4 1 5 3.67 0 0 0 4 0 3 5 3.75 1 4 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 0 8 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 0 8 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 1 0 0 1 1 1 8 4.45 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.45 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 3 0 2 1 3 1 2 3.00 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 1 0 0 2 2 4 2 1 2.82 0 0 1 4 1 4 2 3.17 0 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 6 0 2 0 2 1 1 2 2.82 0 0 1 4 1 4 2 3.17 0 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.33 7 0 2 1 2 0 0 2.00 7 4 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank 0 0 0 2 1 5 4 3.92 1152/1481 0 0 1 1 4 1 5 3.67 1253/1481 0 0 0 4 0 3 5 3.75 1046/1249 1 4 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 959/1424 0 8 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 918/1396 0 8 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 542/1342 1 0 0 1 1 1 8 4.45 535/1459 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1480 3 0 2 1 3 1 2 3.00 1354/1450 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 935/1409 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 1205/1407 1 0 2 2 4 2 1 2.82 1356/1399 0 0 1 4 1 4 2 3.17 1297/1400 0 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1179 6 0 2 0 2 1 1 2.83 1186/1262 6 0 2 0 4 0 0 2.33 1234/1259 7 0 2 1 2 0 0 2.00 1246/1256 7 4 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 788 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 788 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4 3.92 1152/1481 4.31 0 0 1 1 4 1 5 3.67 1253/1481 4.24 0 0 0 4 0 3 5 3.75 1046/1249 4.31 1 4 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 959/1424 4.37 0 8 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 918/1396 4.01 0 8 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 542/1342 4.46 1 0 0 1 1 1 8 4.45 535/1459 4.62 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.45 535/1459 4.62 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1480 5.00 3 0 2 1 3 1 2 3.00 1354/1450 3.99 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 935/1409 4.68 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 1205/1407 4.65 1 0 2 2 4 2 1 2.82 1356/1399 4.03 0 0 1 4 1 4 2 3.17 1297/1400 4.10 0 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1179 **** 6 0 2 0 2 1 1 2.83 1186/1262 2.83 6 0 2 0 4 0 0 2.33 1234/1259 2.33 7 0 2 1 2 0 0 2.00 1246/1256 2.00 7 4 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/788 **** 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/249 **** 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/249 **** 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/240 ****	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean 0 0 0 2 1 5 4 3.92 1152/1481 4.31 4.23 0 0 1 1 4 1 5 3.67 1253/1481 4.24 4.17 0 0 0 0 4 0 3 5 3.75 1046/1249 4.31 4.39 1 4 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 959/1424 4.37 4.14 0 8 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 918/1396 4.01 3.83 0 8 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 542/1342 4.46 4.07 1 0 0 1 1 1 8 4.45 535/1459 4.62 4.28 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1480 5.00 4.83 3 0 2 1 3 1 2 3.00 1354/1450 3.99 4.03 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 935/1409 4.68 4.40 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 1205/1407 4.65 4.70 1 0 2 2 4 2 1 2.82 1356/1399 4.03 4.05 0 0 1 4 1 4 2 3.17 1297/1400 4.10 4.18 0 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.30 ****/1400 **** 3.69 6 0 2 0 2 1 1 2.83 1186/1262 2.83 3.20 6 0 2 0 4 0 0 2.33 1234/1259 2.33 3.65 7 0 2 1 2 0 0 2.00 1246/1256 2.00 3.64 7 4 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.41 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** **** 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** **** 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 242 **** ****	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4 3.92 1152/1481 4.31 4.23 4.29 0 0 1 1 1 4 1 5 3.67 1253/1481 4.24 4.17 4.23 0 0 0 0 4 0 3 5 3.75 1046/1249 4.31 4.39 4.27 1 4 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 959/1424 4.37 4.14 4.21 0 8 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 918/1396 4.01 3.83 3.98 0 8 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 542/1342 4.46 4.07 4.07 1 0 0 1 1 1 8 4.45 535/1459 4.62 4.28 4.16 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1480 5.00 4.83 4.68 3 0 2 1 3 1 2 3.00 1354/1450 3.99 4.03 4.09 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 935/1409 4.68 4.40 4.42 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 1205/1407 4.65 4.70 4.69 1 0 2 2 4 2 1 2.82 1356/1399 4.03 4.05 4.26 0 0 1 4 1 4 2 3.17 1297/1400 4.10 4.18 4.27 0 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1179 **** 3.69 3.96 6 0 2 0 2 1 1 2 2 0 0 2.00 ****/1179 **** 3.69 3.96 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/246 **** **** 4.20 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/249 **** **** 4.20 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/249 **** **** 4.11 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/249 **** **** 4.20 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/249 **** **** 4.40 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/240 **** **** 4.20	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 2 1 5 4 3.92 1152/1481 4.31 4.23 4.29 4.40 0 0 1 1 4 1 5 3.67 1253/1481 4.24 4.17 4.23 4.29 0 0 0 0 4 0 3 5 3.75 1046/1249 4.31 4.39 4.27 4.36 1 4 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 959/1424 4.37 4.14 4.21 4.28 0 8 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 918/1396 4.01 3.83 3.98 3.94 0 8 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 542/1342 4.46 4.07 4.07 4.05 1 0 0 1 1 1 8 4.45 535/1459 4.62 4.28 4.16 4.17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1480 5.00 4.83 4.68 4.68 3 0 2 1 3 1 2 3.00 1354/1450 3.99 4.03 4.09 4.15 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 935/1409 4.68 4.40 4.42 4.47 1 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 1205/1407 4.65 4.70 4.69 4.78 1 0 2 2 4 2 1 2.82 1356/1399 4.03 4.05 4.26 4.29 0 0 1 4 1 4 2 3.17 1297/1400 4.10 4.18 4.27 4.34 0 11 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1179 **** 3.69 3.96 4.05 6 0 2 0 2 1 1 2.83 1186/1262 2.83 3.20 4.05 4.11 6 0 2 0 4 0 0 2.33 1234/1259 2.33 3.65 4.29 4.34 7 0 2 1 2 0 0 2.00 1246/1256 2.00 3.64 4.30 4.28 7 4 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/788 **** 3.41 4.00 3.98

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MATH 225 0301 University of Maryland Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 974

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did v	ou dain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	0	0	9	29	4.67	395/1481	4.31	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.67
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	3	7		4.58	434/1481	4.24	4.17	4.23		4.58
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	7	29	4.64	- ,		4.39	4.27		4.64
	_	uations reflect			1	17	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	,			4.21	4.28	4.67
				what you learned	1	19	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	- ,	4.01	3.83	3.98	3.94	
	_	_		to what you learned	1	22	0	1	0		13		174/1342	4.46	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.69
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	3	5	31	4.72	, -	4.62	4.28	4.16	4.17	
		was class cand			0	1	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.68	5.00
	_			ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	164/1450	3.99	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.75
		Lectur		,	0	0	0	•	-	2	2.2	1 06	0.4.5 / 1.4.0.0	4 60	4 40	4 40	4 45	1 06
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	3	33	4.86	.,	4.68	4.40	4.42		
	· ·					0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84		4.65	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.84
	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	3	4		4.73	300/1399	4.03	4.05	4.26		4.73
	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	•	0	3 0	3	29	4.74		4.10	4.18	4.27		4.74
5. Did at	udiovisua.	I techniques er	nance y	our understanding	4	26	1	0	U	5	3	4.00	****/1179	****	3.69	3.96	4.05	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1262	2.83	3.20	4.05	4.11	****
				ed to participate	34	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1259	2.33	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	34	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1256	2.00	3.64	4.30	4.28	****
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	essful	_	34	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****
				Frequ	lency	r Dist	cribu	ıtioı	1									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 18		Par			or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo	·	3
28-55						1000	10116	su I	JI Ma	. 101	b	U	Graduati	=	U	Maje) <u>T</u>	3
56-83						Ger	neral	l				0	Under-q	rad 3	19	Non-	major	36
84-150						001	-C1 41	_				•	onaci g.			1,011		50
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	zes.				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enona	h
	P 0											-	respons				_	
				I O		Oth	ıer				3	3			5			
				3 0							_							

Course-Section: MATH 251 0101

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 21

NG, YOON J Spring 2006

Page 975 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course E	aluation (Questionnai:	re
------------------	------------	--------------	----

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	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	0	1	5	12	4.25	844/1481	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	0	8	9	4.16	917/1481	4.21	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	573/1249	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	908/1424	4.06	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	269/1396	4.19	3.83	3.98	3.94	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	683/1342	4.29	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	460/1459	4.42	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	702/1480	4.94	4.83	4.68	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	3	10	4.11	781/1450	3.67	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	800/1409	4.37	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	1	15		1091/1407	4.38	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	819/1399	3.95	4.05	4.26	4.29	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	859/1400	3.89	4.18	4.27	4.34	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1179	****	3.69	3.96	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.25	****/1259	****	3.65	4.05	4.11	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1256	****	3.64	4.29	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****
4. Were special techniques successful	Ι/	3	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	700		3.41	4.00	3.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.55	****
miald mass.														
Field Work 3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	1 60	1 61	****
		0	0	0		0	0		, 50	****	++++	4.60	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	****/ 31	* * * * *		4.42	4.80	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 251 0101

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 975 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0201
Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 976 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ns			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fro	m this cou	rse	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	739/1481	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.35
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clea:	r the ex	pected goa	ls	0	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	865/1481	4.21	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.22
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions refle	ct the e	xpected go	als	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	535/1249	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.48
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	t the ex	pected goa	ls	0	8	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1160/1424	4.06	4.14	4.21	4.28	3.80
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contril	bute to	what you 1	earned	0	8	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	668/1396	4.19	3.83	3.98	3.94	4.07
6. Did w	ritten as	signments cont:	ribute t	o what you	learned	0	13	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	238/1342	4.29	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.60
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clear:	ly expla	ined		0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	436/1459	4.42	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled			0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.94	4.83	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all teac	hing effec	tiveness	3	1	2	0	7	7	3	3.47	1236/1450	3.67	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.47
		Lectu:	re																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared		2	0	1	1	1	8	10	4.19	1068/1409	4.37	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.19
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inte	rested i	n the subj	ect	2	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	1194/1407	4.38	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.38
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and e	explained c	learly	2	0	1	2	7	5			1213/1399		4.05	4.26	4.29	3.62
4. Did th	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					2	1	3	4	2	4	7	3.40	1256/1400	3.89	4.18	4.27	4.34	3.40
5. Did a	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					2	18	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1179	****	3.69	3.96	4.05	****
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contril	bute to	what you 1	earned	19	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively e	ncourage	d to parti	cipate	18	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open dis	cussion	19	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1256	****	3.64	4.30	4.28	****
4. Were	special t	echniques succ	essful			19	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****
		Labora	atory																
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequa	ate back	ground inf	ormation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
					Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Farned	Cum. GP	7	Evneate	d Grades				Do:	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
											, . – – –								
00-27							Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55																			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	h
	P 1													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I	0		Ot:	her				2	12						
				?	0														

Course-Section: MATH 251 0301

MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Title Instructor: SOVEREIGN, BRET

Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 977 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	9	9	4.08	1018/1481	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	10	4.24	843/1481	4.21	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	11	4.16	810/1249	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	717/1424	4.06	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	6	8	5	3.95	763/1396	4.19	3.83	3.98	3.94	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	626/1342	4.29	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	6	12	4.25	775/1459	4.42	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	631/1480	4.94	4.83	4.68	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	11	8	0	3.42	1258/1450	3.67	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	839/1409	4.37	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	6	4	14	4.24	1264/1407	4.38	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	9	8		1039/1399	3.95	4.05	4.26	4.29	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	8	10		1017/1400	3.89	4.18	4.27	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.69	3.96	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/1256	****	3.64	4.30	4.28	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 251 0301

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 25

SOVEREIGN, BRET

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 977 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 301 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Baltimore County

Page 978

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH Spring 2006

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	4	11	4.50	549/1481	4.49	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	942/1481	4.35	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	498/1249	4.53	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1160/1424	4.11	4.14	4.21	4.27	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	918/1396	3.59	3.83	3.98	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	974/1342	4.14	4.07	4.07	4.12	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	695/1459	4.48	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.83	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	651/1450	4.42	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	682/1409	4.67	4.40	4.42	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	728/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	938/1399	4.38	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	791/1400	4.53	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1179	***	3.69	3.96	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	Λ	0	2.25	1239/1262	3.20	3.20	4.05	4.14	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1259	4.46	3.65	4.05	4.14	4.25
	12	0	0	0	J T	Τ.	2	4.25	901/1256	4.46	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	U	U	U	2	U	2	4.00	901/1256	4.44	3.64	4.30	4.34	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MATH 301 0201 Title

INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Instructor: TOLL, CHARLES

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 979 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Garage 1														
General	0	0	0	0	2	_	1 /	4 40	F07/1/01	4 40	4 02	4 00	4 20	4 40
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	•	0	3	6	14	4.48	587/1481	4.49	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Τ	8	14	4.57	446/1481	4.35	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	ь	15	4.57	442/1249	4.53	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Ι	3	0	Ι	0	8	10	4.42	533/1424	4.11	4.14	4.21	4.27	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	2	5	5	3		1120/1396	3.59	3.83	3.98	4.00	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	303/1342	4.14	4.07	4.07	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	310/1459	4.48	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.98	4.83	4.68	4.65	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	252/1450	4.42	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	Ο	5	17	4.77	383/1409	4.67	4.40	4.42	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	591/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.64	417/1399	4.38	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	349/1400	4.53	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	0	7	1	1		****/1179	****	3.69	3.96	4.02	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1/	1	U	2	1	1	3.20	/11/9		3.09	3.90	4.02	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	645/1262	3.20	3.20	4.05	4.14	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	4.46	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1256	4.44	3.64	4.30	4.34	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	4.07	****
T - la la														
Laboratory	0.0	•	-	•	•	_	•	1 00		****	****	4 11	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	^ ^ * *	4.11	4.23	^ ^ * *
Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	С	5	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 302 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II Spring 2006

Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 980

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	4	3	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2		1000/1481		4.17	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.14	4.21	4.27	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	3.83	3.98	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	956/1342	3.80	4.07	4.07	4.12	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.83	4.68	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	599/1450	4.29	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1013/1409	4.29	4.40	4.42	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	899/1407	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1120/1399	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.69	3.96	4.02	3.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	8	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	3						

Course-Section: MATH 306 0101 University of Maryland Page 981 Baltimore County Spring 2006 GEOMETRY JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: CAMPBELL, ROBER Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Eval
--

Title

						Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	new insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	780/1481	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.30
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1232/1481	3.70	4.17	4.23	4.23	3.70
3. Did	the exam o	questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	854/1249	4.10	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.10
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	908/1424	4.10	4.14	4.21	4.27	4.10
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	623/1396	4.13	3.83	3.98	4.00	4.13
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	884/1342	3.90	4.07	4.07	4.12	3.90
7. Was	the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	101/1459	4.90	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.90
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.78
1. Were	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1122/1409	4.10	4.40	4.42	4.43	4.10
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.90
				explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1285/1399	3.30	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.30
		es contribute t			0	0	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1256/1400	3.40	4.18	4.27	4.28	3.40
				our understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.69	3.96	4.02	4.67
		Discus	gion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.14	****
				ed to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
		_	_	nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1256	***		4.30	4.34	***
	F						trib	ution	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re:	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
	cum. Gra Expected Grad									, 								,
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3																	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	-major	1

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

Course-Section: MATH 341 0101 University of Maryland Title COMPUTATIONAL METHODS Baltimore County Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB

Spring 2006

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 982

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								- uci		_			LIUCCOI	CCALDO	- Let	CLIDC	,	2200
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Die	d you gain	new insights, ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	769/1481	4.32	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.32
		cuctor make clear			0	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	704/1481			4.23	4.23	4.37
3. Die	d the exam	questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	369/1249	4.63	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.63
4. Dio	d other eva	luations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	7	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	607/1424	4.36	4.14	4.21	4.27	4.36
5. Dic	d assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	7	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	554/1396	4.20	3.83	3.98	4.00	4.20
6. Die	d written a	assignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	454/1342	4.36	4.07	4.07	4.12	4.36
7. Was	the grad	ng system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	310/1459	4.63	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.63
8. Hov	w many time	es was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. Hov	v would you	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	803/1450	4.07	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.07
		Lectur																
1 Wer	re the inst	ructor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	1.0	4.39	913/1409	4 39	4.40	4 42	4.43	4 39
		cuctor seem inter			1		0		1				785/1407		4.70			4.78
				explained clearly		0						4.59			4.05			
		res contribute t				0	1		3			4.18			4.18			4.18
				our understanding	2		1	0	4	4			661/1179					3.93
		-	-															
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.14	
2. Wei	re all stud	lents actively en	courage	ed to participate		0	0		1				****/1259		3.65	4.29	4.34	****
				nd open discussion		0	0	0	0	1			****/1256			4.30		
4. Wei	re special	techniques succe	ssful		15	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iencs	, Dis	trib	ıtioı	n									
				11040	aciic j	DID	CIID	20101										
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	`s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	11
28-55		1.00-1.99		В 2		-			-	J						5		
56-83		2.00-2.99		C 2		Ge	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	8
84-15		3.00-3.49		D 1									5				3	
Grad.		3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	_j h
				P 0									respons					
				I O		Ot	her				1	.2	-					
				? 1														

Course-Section: MATH 390 0101 University of Maryland Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN MATH

I

?

0

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 983

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

SURI, MANIL

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1440/1481	3.11	4.23	4.29	4.29	3.11
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	3	1	1	3	1	2.78	1456/1481		4.17	4.23	4.23	2.78
		uestions reflec			0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	***	4.39	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.14	4.21	4.27	3.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1266/1396	3.11	3.83	3.98	4.00	3.11
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.12	3.00
7. Was tl	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	7	0	1	1	0	1.56	1449/1459	1.56	4.28	4.16	4.17	1.56
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How we	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	1299/1450	3.29	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.29
1 77	-1	Lectur			1	0	_	2	1	1	1	0 50	1205/1400	0 50	4 40	4 40	4 42	0 50
		uctor's lecture			1	0	2	3	Τ	Ţ	Τ.		1395/1409		4.40	4.42	4.43	2.50
		ctor seem inter		_	1	0	0	1 1	0	2	5		1200/1407		4.70	4.69	4.67	4.38
				xplained clearly	1	0 0	2	U T	2 4	2	1		1350/1399		4.05	4.26	4.27 4.28	2.88
		es contribute t		-	2	0	2	0	1	-			1364/1400		4.18	4.27		2.50
5. Did at	udiovisua.	i tecnniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	U	2	U	1	1	3	3.43	934/1179	3.43	3.69	3.96	4.02	3.43
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1034/1262	3.40	3.20	4.05	4.14	3.40
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.80
3. Did tl	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1025/1256	3.80	3.64	4.30	4.34	3.80
		echniques succe		-	5	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.41	4.00	4.07	3.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5			~		or Ma		. – – –	0	Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		Rec	quit	eu I	OT MG	ajors	>	U	Graduat	C	U	Majc	'T	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	

Other

University of Maryland Course-Section: MATH 404 0101 Title INTRO PART DIFF EQ I BELL, JONATHAN Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

21

Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 984

Ctudent	Course	Proplustion	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	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	3	4	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	3.18	1397/1481	3.18	4.17	4.23	4.32	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.14	4.21	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1377/1396	2.38	3.83	3.98	4.09	2.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	310/1459	4.64	4.28	4.16	4.25	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1340/1450	3.11	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1218/1409	3.91	4.40	4.42	4.51	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1205/1407	4.36	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	2	1	1	2.55	1378/1399	2.55	4.05	4.26	4.36	2.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	1	2	2.82	1343/1400	2.82	4.18	4.27	4.38	2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	1	0	1	1	2.14	1153/1179	2.14	3.69	3.96	4.07	2.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.20	4.05	4.33	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1234/1259	2.33	3.65	4.29	4.57	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	0	1		1134/1256		3.64	4.30	4.60	3.33
P		- 5 2 - 4	2 1											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	6	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	2			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: MATH 407 0101

Title MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH

Instructor: GLOOR, PHILIP

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 985 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	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	3	9	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	843/1481	4.23	4.17	4.23	4.32	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424		4.14	4.21	4.35	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	584/1396	4.17	3.83	3.98	4.09	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	257/1342		4.07	4.07	4.21	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1459		4.28	4.16	4.25	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4		1178/1480		4.83	4.68	4.74	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	400/1409	4.77	4.40	4.42	4.51	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	256/1399		4.05	4.26	4.36	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	480/1400		4.18	4.27	4.38	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	0	1	0		****/1179		3.69	3.96	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	Λ	Λ	2 00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1259		3.65	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1256		3.64	4.30	4.60	****
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	TI	U	U	U	U	Т		4.50	/1230		3.04	4.30	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****
Freque	enav	Dia	-ri bı	ıtior	2									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	4	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MATH 408 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO ABSTRACT ALGEBR Instructor:

Ρ

I

0

1

HORTA, ARNALDO Spring 2006

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 986

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
1 Di	d 17011 ga	in now	General		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.45	5.00
	1 0		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.17	4.23	4.32	4.83
					expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	184/1249		4.39	4.27	4.44	4.83
		_	tions reflect		_	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424		4.14	4.21	4.35	5.00
					what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1396		3.83	3.98	4.09	4.50
			_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1342		4.07	4.07	4.21	4.83
			system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.25	4.50
8. Ho	w many t	imes wa	as class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. Ho	w would	you gr	ade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.67
			Lecture	9															
1. We	ere the i	nstruc	tor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.40	4.42	4.51	4.83
2. Di	d the in	struct	or seem inter	ested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.83
3. Wa	as lectur	e mate	rial presented	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1399	4.83	4.05	4.26	4.36	4.83
4. Di	d the le	ctures	contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.83	4.18	4.27	4.38	4.83
5. Di	ld audiov	isual	techniques enl	nance	your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	3.69	3.96	4.07	****
			Discus	sion															
1. Di	d class	discus	sions contrib	ite to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	***
2. We	ere all s	tudent	s actively end	courag	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.57	****
3. Di	ld the in	struct	or encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	****	3.64	4.30	4.60	****
					Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credi	ts Earne	d	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	}
															- 				
00-2			0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-5			1.00-1.99	0	B 2 C 0		Q		1				_	TTm d and		_	Mar		2
56-8 84-1			2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1	C 0		Ger	nera!	Т				5	Under-g	rau	6	Non-	major	2
Grad			3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh

Other

1

Course-Section: MATH 409 0101 University of Maryl Title INTRO TO MATH LOGIC Baltimore County Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM Spring 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor

Frequencies

Page 987

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	16	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.00
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.17	4.23	4.32	3.67
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the ϵ	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	451/1249	4.56	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.56
		uations reflect		1 3	1	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.14	4.21	4.35	4.75
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	,	4.71	3.83	3.98	4.09	4.71
		_		to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	4		112/1342	4.80	4.07	4.07	4.21	4.80
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1242/1459	3.56	4.28	4.16	4.25	3.56
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.83	4.68	4.74	4.50
9. How we	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1013/1409	4.29	4.40	4.42	4.51	4.29
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1053/1407	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.57
3. Was 1	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.05	4.26	4.36	3.50
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1278/1400	3.29	4.18	4.27	4.38	3.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc			what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	****
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.57	****
		-	_	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	3.64	4.30	4.60	****
				Freq	uency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S 			Тур	e 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	S	1	Graduate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ge:	nera:	L				4	Under-gr	ad	9	Non-	-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					4						
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 988

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

LINEAR ALGEBRA Instructor: PITTENGER, ARTH Spring 2006 Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
		Frequencies
	Onestions	NT NT 1 2 2 1 E N

Course-Section: MATH 411 0101

Title

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quebelonb			- 											
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.17	4.23	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.14	4.21	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	918/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	4.09	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.40	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.05	4.26	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.18	4.27	4.38	4.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MATH 423 0101 University of Maryland Title DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 989

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

ZWECK, JOHN

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did	you gain :	new insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.78
2. Did	the instr	uctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1481	4.78	4.17	4.23	4.32	4.78
3. Did	the exam	questions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	154/1249	4.89	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.89
4. Did	other eva	luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.14	4.21	4.35	4.00
5. Did	assigned :	readings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	839/1396	3.86	3.83	3.98	4.09	3.86
6. Did	written a	ssignments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.21	4.50
7. Was	the gradi	ng system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	800/1459	4.22	4.28	4.16	4.25	4.22
8. How	many time	s was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1450	4.89	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.89
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	the inst	ructor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.40	4.42	4.51	5.00
		uctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	3		753/1399	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.36	4.33
		res contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	287/1400		4.18	4.27	4.38	
		Discuss	ri on															
1 Did	alace die			what you learned	Ω	0	0	0	Λ	0	1	5 00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	****
		ents actively end			8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.57	****
		-	_	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1256		3.64	4.30	4.60	****
				Frequ	encv	Digt	trib	ıtior	1									
				ricqu	iciicy	DIS	CIID	10101	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3						. J . –		-	- 3	-	-	5		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				3	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	3
04_150	-	2 00 2 10	2	D 0				_				-	011001 9.		-	1.011		

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

Course-Section: MATH 432 0101 University of Maryland
Title HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

Enrollment: 12 Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 990

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

1 4.50 ****/1259 **** 3.65 4.29 4.57 ****

0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1256 **** 3.64 4.30 4.60 ****

			E-m/	20101	ncies	~		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
			L L C	-quei		5 .	_				_			
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	2	4	4	3.91	1162/1481	3.91	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1221/1481	3.73	4.17	4.23	4.32	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1088/1249	3.64	4.39	4.27	4.44	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1087/1424	3.90	4.14	4.21	4.35	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	942/1396	3.73	3.83	3.98	4.09	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	3	2	3 09	1257/1342	3.09	4.07	4.07	4.21	3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	4	0	1		1436/1459		4.28	4.16	4.25	2.18
	-	•	_		-	0	11		,				1.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480		4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.78
Tankuna														
Lecture	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	6	3		1236/1409		4.40	4.42	4.51	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	705/1407	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1206/1399	3.64	4.05	4.26	4.36	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1116/1400	3.82	4.18	4.27	4.38	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	2	2	1		1041/1179		3.69	3.96	4.07	3.00
5. 214 dadis.ibadi tecimildaes cimanee jour anderstanding	_		_		-	-	_	3.00		3.00	3.03	3.70	1.07	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	****
-:	_	•	-	-	_	•	•		, 1202		0	00		

sion 9 0 0 0 Frequency Distribution

0

0

0

0

1

9

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MATH 479 0101

Title MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S

Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 991 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	4	3	3.70	1283/1481	3.70	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.17	4.23	4.32	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	****	4.39	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1207/1424	3.71	4.14	4.21	4.35	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1424/1459	2.60	4.28	4.16	4.25	2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1325/1409	3.33	4.40	4.42	4.51	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.05	4.26	4.36	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.18	4.27	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	***	3.69	3.96	4.07	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	3.20	4.05	4.33	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	729/1259	4.87	3.65	4.05	4.53	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.64	4.30	4.60	5.00
3. Did the institution encourage rail and open discussion	,	U	U	U	U	U	J	3.00	1/1250	3.00	3.01	4.50	4.00	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 68	4.80	4.80	4.49	4.68	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	49/ 69	4.38	4.38	4.53	4.64	4.38
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	40/ 63	4.25	4.25	4.44	4.49	4.25
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	42/ 69	4.25	4.25	4.35	4.53	4.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	3	4	0	0	2.38	61/ 68	2.38	2.38	3.92	4.10	2.38

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101 University of Maryland Title JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 992

Baltimore County Spring 2006 MATH MODELING Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14

and the second second	2	_			
Questionnaires:	8	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	eane	ncies	.		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.75
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.17	4.23	4.32	3.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	1236/1424	3.63	4.14	4.21	4.35	3.63
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1380/1396	2.33	3.83	3.98	4.09	2.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	3.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1177/1459	3.71	4.28	4.16	4.25	3.71
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1160/1450	3.61	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.61
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	762/1409	3.96	4.40	4.42	4.51	3.96
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	823/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.54
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1210/1399	3.38	4.05	4.26	4.36	3.38
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1400	4.03	4.18	4.27	4.38	4.03
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	1	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.38	3.69	3.96	4.07	2.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair a	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.64	4.30	4.60	4.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful	_	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27		0.00-0.99					~					·			·	 Mo∹-		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 1		Red	quir(eu I	or Ma	Jors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	ΣĹ	4
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 1	B 1 C 2		Cos	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad	8	Non	-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-2.99	2	D 0		Ger	iera.	т				ے	onder-9	ı au	0	MOI1-	-major	4
Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	4	ਦ 0 ਜ 0		בוק	ect i	760				0	#### -	Meand +	here a	re not	enous	rh

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

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101 University of Maryland Page 993 Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 MATH MODELING Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 8

0

3.50-4.00 4

Grad.

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.75
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.17	4.23	4.32	3.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	1236/1424	3.63	4.14	4.21	4.35	3.63
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1380/1396	2.33	3.83	3.98	4.09	2.33
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	3.00
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1177/1459	3.71	4.28	4.16	4.25	3.71
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	836/1450	3.61	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.61
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1110/1409	3.96	4.40	4.42	4.51	3.96
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1107/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.54
				explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1163/1399	3.38	4.05	4.26	4.36	3.38
		ures contribute to what you learned				0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	969/1400	4.03	4.18	4.27	4.38	4.03
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	3	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1104/1179	2.38	3.69	3.96	4.07	2.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.64	4.30	4.60	4.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	***	3.41	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	ı									
								_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

5

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

I

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 MATH MODELING Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 994

			Fr	eane.	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	-		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.17	4.23	4.32	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	1236/1424	3.63	4.14	4.21	4.35	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1380/1396	2.33	3.83	3.98	4.09	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 1	1	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1177/1459	3.71	4.28	4.16	4.25	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1329/1450	3.61	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	5	0	3.25	1338/1409	3.96	4.40	4.42	4.51	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3			1200/1407	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.79	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	1			1363/1399	3.38	4.05	4.26	4.36	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1165/1400	4.03	4.18	4.27	4.38	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1179	2.38	3.69	3.96	4.07	2.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.20	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	0		,		3.65	4.29	4.57	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	0				3.64	4.30	4.60	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 788		3.41		4.26	****
Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4

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

Course-Section: MATH 602 0101
Title COMPLEX ANALYSIS
Instructor: PITTENGER, ARTH
Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 995 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Question	nnaıre
------------------------------------	--------

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor 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	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.17	4.23	4.11	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.14	4.21	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.83	3.98	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.01	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.83	4.68	4.74	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.05	4.26	4.16	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.18	4.27	4.17	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.69	3.96	3.81	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons			Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
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.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other						
				?	0							

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: MATH 611 0101

7

APPLIED ANALYSIS

SEIDMAN, THOMAS

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Job IRBR3029

Page 996

JUN 13, 2006

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	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	2	2	3.67	1299/1481	3.67	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1401/1481	3.17	4.17	4.23	4.11	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1118/1249	3.50	4.39	4.27	4.24	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.14	4.21	4.16	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	3.83	3.98	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	956/1342	3.80	4.07	4.07	4.18	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.28	4.16	4.01	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.83	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1325/1409	3.33	4.40	4.42	4.36	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1381/1399	2.50	4.05	4.26	4.16	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1297/1400	3.17	4.18	4.27	4.17	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1114/1179	2.67	3.69	3.96	3.81	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	Ω	1	1	1	Λ	Ο	2 00	1245/1262	2.00	3.20	4.05	4.07	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	1	n	0		1255/1259		3.65	4.29	4.30	1.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	0	0		1246/1256	2.00	3.64	4.30	4.33	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	_	_	_	5	O	2.00	1210/1250	2.00	3.01	1.30	1.33	2.00

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

Course-Section: MATH 614 0101 University of Maryland PARTIAL DIFFERENTL EQ Baltimore County HOFFMAN, KATHLE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

3

Page 997 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.17	4.23	4.11	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.39	4.27	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.14	4.21	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.83	3.98	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.28	4.16	4.01	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.40	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.05	4.26	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.18	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.69	3.96	3.81	5.00
From	onar	. Dia	- rib	u+ i o	^									

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

Course-Section: MATH 621 0101 University of Maryland Title NUMERICAL ANALYSIS II Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 998

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequenc						ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.17	4.23	4.11	4.75
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.39	4.27	4.24	4.33
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424		4.14	4.21	4.16	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.83	3.98	4.00	4.67
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.67
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.01	5.00
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480		4.83	4.68	4.74	
	-			ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.03	4.09		4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	0		1002/1399	4.00	4.05	4.26	4.16	4.00
					1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.18	4.27		4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	0	0	0	0	1	2		177/1179	4.67		3.96		4.67
J. Dia aa	arovibua.	r cccimiques en	nance y	our unacrotamaring	_	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_	1.07	17771175	1.07	3.05	3.50	3.01	1.07
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1		708/1262		3.20	4.05	4.07	4.00
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	3.65	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.64	4.30	4.33	5.00
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribu	te to w	nat you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.01	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	3	0	Graduate	е	3	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		~		,				2	1	,	-			2
56-83						Ge	nera	L				3	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	3
84-150						_						_			_			
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					jh	
Р 0													response	es to b	e sign	ufican	ıt	
I 0					Ot!	her					0							
				? 0														

Course-Section: MATH 625 0101 University of Maryland COMP MATH & C PROG ROSTAMIAN, ROUB

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

Page 999 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

	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	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.17	4.23	4.11	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.14	4.21	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.83	3.98	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.05	4.26	4.16	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.18	4.27	4.17	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	134/1179	4.75	3.69	3.96	3.81	4.75

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

MATRIX ANALYSIS MINKOFF, SUSAN Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

Title

Instructor:

Course-Section: MATH 630 0101

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1000

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
	_	General																
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	2	2	4			1143/1481		4.23	4.29	4.28	3.92
		tor make clear			0	0	1	2	1	5	4		1237/1481		4.17	4.23	4.11	3.69
	_	estions reflect		_	0	0	2	1	3	3	4		1125/1249		4.39	4.27	4.24	3.46
		ations reflect			0	4	2	0	1	1	5		1175/1424		4.14	4.21	4.16	3.78
	_	_		what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	3			942/1396		3.83	3.98	4.00	3.73
		_		o what you learned		1	1	1	2	5	3		1039/1342		4.07	4.07	4.18	3.67
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	1	2	2	8		732/1459		4.28	4.16	4.01	4.31
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	10			1230/1480		4.83	4.68		4.23
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.67
1. Were th	1	0	2	1	Λ	2	7	3 92	1211/1409	3.92	4.40	4.42	4.36	3.92				
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	1	1	3	7		1221/1407		4.70	4.69	4.73	4.33
				xplained clearly	1	0	1	2	0	1	8		973/1399		4.05	4.26	4.16	4.08
		s contribute to		-	1	0	2	1	1	3	5		1183/1400		4.18	4.27	4.17	3.67
				our understanding	2	2	1	0	4	2	2		924/1179			3.96		3.44
J. Dia aa	aiovibaai	ccciniiques em	lance y	our understanding	2	2	_	U	1	2	2	3.11	JZ 1/ 11/J	3.11	3.05	3.50	3.01	3.11
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	976/1262	3.56	3.20	4.05	4.07	3.56
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	643/1259	4.44	3.65	4.29	4.30	4.44
3. Did the	e instruct	tor encourage f	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1079/1256	3.63	3.64	4.30	4.33	3.63
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		6	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.41	4.00	3.97	4.00
				E		- D.;	d la .		_									
				Freq	uency	DIST	trib	utioi	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					Red	auire	ed fo	or M	ajors	. – – –	0	 Graduat	 e	8	Majo	 r	8
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3							-1			,		-	2_ 244440	-	-	- 100) 0	-	Ü
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	major	5	
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0												3				-		
Grad. 8 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

10

0

0

1

I

Course-Section: MATH 650 0101 University of Maryland Title FOUNDINS OF OPTIMIZATI Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 1001

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.41 4.00 3.97 ****

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 10
Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 4.43 652/1481 4.43 4.23 4.29 4.28 4.43 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 1000/1481 4.00 4.17 4.23 4.11 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 172/1249 4.86 4.39 4.27 4.24 4.86 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 2 0 0 3 0 2.80 1397/1424 2.80 4.14 4.21 4.16 2.80 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 3 0 3 4.00 707/1396 4.00 3.83 3.98 4.00 4.00 99/1342 4.86 4.07 4.07 4.18 4.86 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1480 5.00 4.83 4.68 4.74 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 2 3 1 3.83 1030/1450 3.83 4.03 4.09 3.96 3.83 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 1013/1409 4.29 4.40 4.42 4.36 4.29 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1407 5.00 4.70 4.69 4.73 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 4.05 4.26 4.16 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 844/1400 4.29 4.18 4.27 4.17 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1179 **** 3.69 3.96 3.81 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 0 2 0 3.00 1146/1262 3.00 3.20 4.05 4.07 3.00 0 2 0 3.00 1162/1259 3.00 3.65 4.29 4.30 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 1 1 3.33 1134/1256 3.33 3.64 4.30 4.33 3.33

Frequency Distribution

4 2 0

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

Course-Section: MATH 710 0101 University of Maryland Title SPEC TOPICS IN APPL MA Baltimore County

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Page 1002 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

Grad.

3

3.50-4.00

1

3

							Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1299/1481	3.67	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.67
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	1	0	0	0	2		1253/1481		4.17	4.23	4.11	3.67
		ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.14	4.21	4.16	4.33
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.83	3.98	4.00	4.50
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	4.07	4.07	4.18	3.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.28	4.16	4.01	3.67
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.83	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.67
1. Were th	ne instru	Lectur actor's lecture	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.67
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	2				4.70	4.69	4.73	4.67
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3				4.05	4.26	4.16	5.00
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,		4.18	4.27	4.17	4.33
				your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.69	3.96	3.81	3.67
1 5'1 1		Discus			•		0	•	-	0	0	2 65	001/1060	2 65	2 00	4 05	4 00	2 60
				what you learned	0	0	0	0 1	0	2	0		931/1262 1067/1259		3.20		4.07	3.67
		_	_	ed to participate nd open discussion	0	0	1	U T	0	0	2		1067/1259				4.30	3.67
3. Did the	e Instruc	cor encourage	Iaii ai	id open discussion	U	U	1	U	U	U	2	3.07	1009/1250	3.07	3.04	4.30	4.33	3.07
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 3						Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	 5	1	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 r	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0							\				-			-	-) ~		_
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	major	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0													5		-		3	_
04-130 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0						_						_						

Electives

Other

0

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant