```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1033
Title           INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH          Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     JONES, CRISTEN                 Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      66
Questionnaires:  40                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  2  3  7 10 17  3.95 1206/1639  3.95   4.18  4.27 4.08  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  2  6 11 20  4.26  859/1639  4.26   4.23  4.22 4.17  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  2  4  8 25  4.44  617/1397  4.44   4.28  4.28 4.18  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   4  0  1  8  8 18  4.23  822/1583  4.23   4.17  4.19 4.01  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   6  3  3  9  5 12  3.63 1168/1532  3.63   3.79  4.01 3.88  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9  0  3  5  7 16  4.16  701/1504  4.16   4.13  4.05 3.78  4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  2  6  9 21  4.29  779/1612  4.29   4.34  4.16 4.10  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1  3  3  8 19  5  3.53 1602/1635  3.53   4.77  4.65 4.56  3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  1  1 14 10  5  3.55 1298/1579  3.55   3.98  4.08 3.95  3.55


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         7   0  1  2  7  9 14  4.00 1237/1518  4.00   4.46  4.43 4.38  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    7   0  0  1  6  9 17  4.27 1349/1520  4.27   4.67  4.70 4.61  4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7   0  0  2  4 13 14  4.18  956/1517  4.18   4.14  4.27 4.20  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   1  1  2  6  7 17  4.12 1010/1550  4.12   3.97  4.22 4.17  4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  5  2  4  8  8  5  3.37 1048/1295  3.37   3.69  3.94 3.84  3.37


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  1  0  4  7 12  4.21  669/1398  4.21   3.55  4.07 3.85  4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  2  1  4  2 14  4.09  945/1391  4.09   3.71  4.30 4.07  4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0  1  2  3  7 11  4.04  933/1388  4.04   3.79  4.28 4.01  4.04
4. Were special techniques successful                   18  6  2  1  3  3  7  3.75  610/ 958  3.75   3.35  3.93 3.71  3.75


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   34  1  0  1  1  0  3  4.00 ****/ 224  ****   2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0  0  1  0  4  4.60 ****/ 240  ****   2.86  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 1  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/ 219  ****   ****  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            35  1  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/ 215  ****   ****  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  35  1  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/ 198  ****   4.00  4.18 4.25  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  85  ****   ****  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 37 0 0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  82  ****   ****  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  78  ****   ****  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  80  ****   ****  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  82  ****   ****  4.16 3.90  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  52  ****   ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  36  0  1  0  0  0  3  4.00 ****/  53  ****   ****  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  42  ****   ****  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  37  ****   ****  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****   ****  4.56 4.60  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  50  ****   ****  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****   ****  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  43  ****   ****  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****   ****  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      37  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  21  ****   ****  4.52 5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	40
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0201              University of Maryland                          Page 1034
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   RILEY, SAMANTHA               Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     56
Questionnaires:  35                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  3  5  7 20  4.26  890/1639  4.07 4.18 4.27 4.08 4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  8 26  4.71  295/1639  4.56 4.23 4.22 4.17 4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  5 29  4.80  230/1397  4.59 4.28 4.28 4.18 4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  10  0  0  1  5 19  4.72  281/1583  4.30 4.17 4.19 4.01 4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  9  2  3  6  2 12  3.76 1035/1532  3.98 3.79 4.01 3.88 3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 21 0  0  1  2 10 4.69  222/1504  4.33 4.13 4.05 3.78 4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  3  2  2 28  4.57  418/1612  4.46 4.34 4.16 4.10 4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  5 28  4.85  751/1635  4.59 4.77 4.65 4.56 4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0  0  3  6 16 4.52  362/1579  4.28 3.98 4.08 3.95 4.52

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0  0  0  0  4 25  4.86  271/1518  4.71 4.46 4.43 4.38 4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0  0  0  0  3 26  4.90  571/1520  4.81 4.67 4.70 4.61 4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0  0  0  0  4 25  4.86  189/1517  4.58 4.14 4.27 4.20 4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   1  0  1  1  4 23  4.69  435/1550  4.58 3.97 4.22 4.17 4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 13 2  0  1  4  8 4.07  595/1295  3.94 3.69 3.94 3.84 4.07

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0  3  1  1  3  8 3.75  965/1398  3.99 3.55 4.07 3.85 3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0  1  0  3  4 10 4.22  839/1391  4.15 3.71 4.30 4.07 4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 1  0  3  2 10 4.25  834/1388  4.11 3.79 4.28 4.01 4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  18   6  1  2  2  2  4 3.55  707/ 958  3.35 3.35 3.93 3.71 3.55

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 34 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 2.86 4.11 4.01 ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 33 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  85 **** **** 4.58 4.50 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 34 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  82 **** **** 4.52 4.12 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 34 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  78 **** **** 4.47 4.25 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    34   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  80 **** **** 4.47 4.39 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                34   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  82 **** **** 4.16 3.90 ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  50 **** **** 4.45 4.54 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    34   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32 **** **** 4.51 4.67 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      34   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  43 **** **** 4.69 4.69 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       34   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32 **** **** 4.37 4.67 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     34   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  21 **** **** 4.52 5.00 ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      9      0.00-0.99    1      A   18       Required for Majors  15    Graduate      0      Major       0
28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B    7
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1      C    4       General               0    Under-grad   35      Non-major  35
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    1      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2      F    0       Electives             4    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other                14
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0301                 University of Maryland                                    Page 1035
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC              Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   INAMDAR, NARAYA                  Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      55
Questionnaires: 26                             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   2   1   4   8  10  3.92 1229/1639  4.07  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   1   0   0   5  19  4.64  371/1639  4.56  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   1   0   0   7  17  4.56  457/1397  4.59  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   7   2   1   1   4  10  4.06  974/1583  4.30  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  10   1   1   1   2  10  4.27  571/1532  3.98  3.79  4.01  3.88  4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 11  0   0   0   5   9  4.64  260/1504  4.33  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   1   0   6   4  14  4.20  882/1612  4.46  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1   0   0   0   5  19  4.79  825/1635  4.59  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1   1   1   0  11   6  4.05  859/1579  4.28  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.05

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   1   0   0   4  18  4.65  616/1518  4.71  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0   1   0   0   2  18  4.71  961/1520  4.81  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   0   1   0   4  17  4.68  382/1517  4.58  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   2   1   0   1   3  17  4.59  533/1550  4.58  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  7   3   0   0   3   9  4.00  623/1295  3.94  3.69  3.94  3.84  4.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0   0   1   3   5   5  4.00  770/1398  3.99  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0   0   0   5   3   6  4.07  950/1391  4.15  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   2   0   2   4   7  3.93 1007/1388  4.11  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.93
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  8   0   0   3   1   2  3.83 ****/ 958  3.35  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   23  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 1  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  24  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  24  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     24  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      24  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0401              University of Maryland                              Page 1036
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   RILEY, SAMANTHA               Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     60
Questionnaires: 31                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  7  9 14  4.16  990/1639  4.07  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  5 25  4.77  231/1639  4.56  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  0  0  0  1  3 25  4.83  216/1397  4.59  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  7  0  0  1  6 17  4.67  323/1583  4.30  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1 12  1  2  2  1 12  4.17  655/1532  3.98  3.79  4.01  3.88  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 16  2  0  0  2 10  4.29  585/1504  4.33  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  2  4 24  4.73  238/1612  4.46  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 20 11  4.35 1273/1635  4.59  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  0 10 17  4.63  269/1579  4.28  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.63


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  1 28  4.97   85/1518  4.71  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  4 26  4.87  648/1520  4.81  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  3 27  4.90  157/1517  4.58  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  0  3 26  4.90  185/1550  4.58  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 14  2  2  1  3  8  3.81  798/1295  3.94  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.81


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  2  0  1  1 14  4.39  525/1398  3.99  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  1  0  3  0 13  4.41  686/1391  4.15  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  1  1  1  5 13  4.33  783/1388  4.11  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  6  0  2  1  5  7  4.13  418/ 958  3.35  3.35  3.93  3.71  4.13


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  27  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27  0  1  0  0  0  3  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                27  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  28  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       28  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   28  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  28  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    28  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      28  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       28  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     28  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   9   0.00-0.99   4   A   15   Required for Majors 17   Graduate   1   Major   0
 28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   8
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   4   General   0   Under-grad 30   Non-major 31
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   0   D   1
 Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0   responses to be significant
                                       I   0   Other   11
                                       ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0601            University of Maryland                              Page 1037
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL               Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      99
Questionnaires: 55                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions              NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    3   0   2   3  17  17  13  3.69 1397/1639  4.07  4.18  4.27 4.08  3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0   1   3  13  13  22  4.00 1090/1639  4.56  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0   0   4  13   5  30  4.17  869/1397  4.59  4.28  4.28 4.18  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4  15   1   7  10  10   8  3.47 1418/1583  4.30  4.17  4.19 4.01  3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  22   2   4  12   5   6  3.31 1338/1532  3.98  3.79  4.01 3.88  3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 31  1   2   7   6   5  3.57 1171/1504  4.33  4.13  4.05 3.78  3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   2   0   5   4  18  23  4.18  903/1612  4.46  4.34  4.16 4.10  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0   0   0   0  45   7  4.13 1434/1635  4.59  4.77  4.65 4.56  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1  2   2  13  16   8  3.63 1251/1579  4.28  3.98  4.08 3.95  3.63


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         7   0   0   2   8  11  27  4.31 1042/1518  4.71  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    7   0   0   1   2   9  36  4.67 1033/1520  4.81  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7   0   3   2  11  15  17  3.85 1211/1517  4.58  4.14  4.27 4.20  3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   1   3   2   6  16  22  4.06 1048/1550  4.58  3.97  4.22 4.17  4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 24   4   2   6   3   9  3.46 1006/1295  3.94  3.69  3.94 3.84  3.46


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0   5   2  15   7  11  3.42 1150/1398  3.99  3.55  4.07 3.85  3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0   6   4  11   7  13  3.41 1244/1391  4.15  3.71  4.30 4.07  3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0   3   4  12  11  13  3.63 1148/1388  4.11  3.79  4.28 4.01  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   14 25   6   1   6   1   2  2.50  917/ 958  3.35  3.35  3.93 3.71  2.50


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   40 12   1   1   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 42 0   2   3   1   6   1  3.08 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 42 9   0   1   1   0   2  3.75 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            44  8   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 48  6   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.50  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  51  0   1   0   1   2   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  51  0   1   0   1   2   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        50  4   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    50  4   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 5.00  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 50  0   0   1   1   2   1  3.60 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     50  0   0   0   2   1   2  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       50  2   0   0   1   0   1  3.67 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        50  2   1   1   1   0   0  2.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      50  3   0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0601                    University of Maryland                          Page 1037
Title          ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC             Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL                    Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      99
Questionnaires: 55                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    12        0.00-0.99   2         A    8         Required for Majors  25     Graduate      0        Major         0
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0         B   16
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99   1         C   16         General               0     Under-grad   55        Non-major    55
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49   2         D    3
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2         F    0         Electives             3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                19
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0801           University of Maryland                              Page 1038
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC         Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    STARK, BETSY               Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    85
Questionnaires: 59                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	13	9	35	4.31	841/1639	4.07	4.18	4.27	4.08	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	46	4.68	338/1639	4.56	4.23	4.22	4.17	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	1	49	4.58	447/1397	4.59	4.28	4.28	4.18	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	1	0	4	5	33	4.60	371/1583	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.01	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	7	7	30	4.39	450/1532	3.98	3.79	4.01	3.88	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	1	4	4	19	4.46	416/1504	4.33	4.13	4.05	3.78	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	9	4	45	4.62	364/1612	4.46	4.34	4.16	4.10	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81	811/1635	4.59	4.77	4.65	4.56	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	3	12	25	4.55	332/1579	4.28	3.98	4.08	3.95	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	5	46	4.76	454/1518	4.71	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	1	52	4.91	546/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	4	8	41	4.58	498/1517	4.58	4.14	4.27	4.20	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	3	5	42	4.65	468/1550	4.58	3.97	4.22	4.17	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	28	2	0	2	3	16	4.35	391/1295	3.94	3.69	3.94	3.84	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	6	4	21	4.38	532/1398	3.99	3.55	4.07	3.85	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	4	5	25	4.62	534/1391	4.15	3.71	4.30	4.07	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	2	5	4	23	4.41	730/1388	4.11	3.79	4.28	4.01	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	25	16	4	2	4	2	6	3.22	813/ 958	3.35	3.35	3.93	3.71	3.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	4	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	2.50	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	****/ 240	****	2.86	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 198	****	4.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****

Enrollment: 85
Questionnaires: 59   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   10   0.00-0.99   1   A   17   Required for Majors 16   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   19
56-83   4   2.00-2.99   4   C   9   General   0   Under-grad   59   Non-major   59
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   7   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   24
                                           ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 106Y 0101                  University of Maryland                                    Page 1039
Title           ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC          Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     BARADWAJ, RAJAL (Instr. A)         Fall   2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     9
Questionnaires: 7                               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                            NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  2  1  3  1  3.43 1523/1639  3.43  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  3  1  3.57 1455/1639  3.57  4.23  4.22  4.17  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  1  1  0  4  3.71 1195/1397  3.71  4.28  4.28  4.18  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  3  2  1  3.29 1350/1532  3.29  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  1  0  3  0  1  3.00 1415/1504  3.00  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  2  3  1  1  3.14 1501/1612  3.14  4.34  4.16  4.10  3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  7  0  4.00 1497/1635  4.00  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  5  1  0  3.17 1448/1579  2.92  3.98  4.08  3.95  2.92


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  1  2  2  2  3.71 1381/1518  3.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29 1345/1520  4.14  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  1  1  1  3  3.57 1321/1517  3.79  4.14  4.27  4.20  3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  2  1  3  3.86 1188/1550  3.76  3.97  4.22  4.17  3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  623/1295  4.17  3.69  3.94  3.84  4.17


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  0  1  2  1  3.00 1271/1398  3.00  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  1  0  2  1  2  3.50 1220/1391  3.50  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  2  0  1  1  2  3.17 1292/1388  3.17  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.17
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  2  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  610/ 958  3.75  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.75


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4  1  1  0  0  1  0  2.50  221/ 224  2.50  2.50  4.10  3.90  2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 1  0  0  1  0  2.50  231/ 240  2.50  2.86  4.11  4.01  2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  129/ 198  4.00  4.00  4.18  4.25  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 106Y 0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1040
Title      ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC           Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WELLS, ELIZABET (Instr. B)        Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  7                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  2  1  3  1 3.43 1523/1639 3.43 4.18 4.27 4.08 3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  3  1 3.57 1455/1639 3.57 4.23 4.22 4.17 3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  1  1  0  4 3.71 1195/1397 3.71 4.28 4.28 4.18 3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  3  2 4.00 1010/1583 4.00 4.17 4.19 4.01 4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  3  2  1 3.29 1350/1532 3.29 3.79 4.01 3.88 3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1  0  3  0  1 3.00 1415/1504 3.00 4.13 4.05 3.78 3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  2  3  1  1 3.14 1501/1612 3.14 4.34 4.16 4.10 3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  7  0 4.00 1497/1635 4.00 4.77 4.65 4.56 4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 2 0 2 2 0 2.67 1541/1579 2.92 3.98 4.08 3.95 2.92

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  1  1  1  0  3 3.50 1419/1518 3.61 4.46 4.43 4.38 3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  1  0  0  2  3 4.00 1414/1520 4.14 4.67 4.70 4.61 4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1  0  1  0  4 4.00 1083/1517 3.79 4.14 4.27 4.20 3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  1  0  1  3 3.67 1274/1550 3.76 3.97 4.22 4.17 3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 0  1  0  2 4.33  398/1295 4.17 3.69 3.94 3.84 4.17

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2  0  1  2  1 3.00 1271/1398 3.00 3.55 4.07 3.85 3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1  0  2  1  2 3.50 1220/1391 3.50 3.71 4.30 4.07 3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 2 0 1  1  2 3.17 1292/1388 3.17 3.79 4.28 4.01 3.17
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  2  1  0  0  1  2 3.75  610/ 958 3.75 3.35 3.93 3.71 3.75

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4  1  1  0  0  1  0 2.50  221/ 224 2.50 2.50 4.10 3.90 2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 1 0 0 1  0 2.50  231/ 240 2.50 2.86 4.11 4.01 2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 1 0 0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5  1  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  5  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00  129/ 198 4.00 4.00 4.18 4.25 4.00

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 115  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1041
Title       FINITE MATHEMATICS              Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    KOGAN, JACOB                 Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      57
Questionnaires: 19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  5  3  7  4  0  2.53 1629/1639  2.53  4.18  4.27 4.08  2.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  7  3  7  2  0  2.21 1635/1639  2.21  4.23  4.22 4.17  2.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1  2  4  8  2  2  2.89 1380/1397  2.89  4.28  4.28 4.18  2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9  1  1  5  3  0  3.00 1532/1583  3.00  4.17  4.19 4.01  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  4  7  1  2  3.07 1412/1532  3.07  3.79  4.01 3.88  3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 1  2  4  2  0  2.78 1452/1504  2.78  4.13  4.05 3.78  2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  4  6  2  4  3  2.79 1560/1612  2.79  4.34  4.16 4.10  2.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65 4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 3 3  8  1  0  2.47 1557/1579  2.47  3.98  4.08 3.95  2.47

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  4  1  5  2  3  2.93 1490/1518  2.93  4.46  4.43 4.38  2.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  1  1  5  3  5  3.67 1478/1520  3.67  4.67  4.70 4.61  3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  7  2  5  0  1  2.07 1509/1517  2.07  4.14  4.27 4.20  2.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1  5  4  4  3  0  2.31 1507/1550  2.31  3.97  4.22 4.17  2.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 13 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94 3.84  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  3  1  6  4  0  2.79 1326/1398  2.79  3.55  4.07 3.85  2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  2  0  7  4  1  3.14 1300/1391  3.14  3.71  4.30 4.07  3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  2  1  4  5  2  3.29 1262/1388  3.29  3.79  4.28 4.01  3.29
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  11  0  2  0  1  0  2.67 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 3.71  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1      0.00-0.99    1       A    1         Required for Majors  10     Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55    0      1.00-1.99    0       B    7
  56-83    2      2.00-2.99    1       C    6         General              0      Under-grad  19        Non-major   19
  84-150   3      3.00-3.49    4       D    1
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00    0       F    0         Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I    0         Other                6
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 131  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1042
Title       MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I          Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                    Fall  2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      32
Questionnaires: 23                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  4  5 14  4.43  712/1639  4.43  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  7 14  4.48  567/1639  4.48  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4 18  4.74  302/1397  4.74  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  1  3  1 10  4.33  697/1583  4.33  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5  0  1  2  2 13  4.50  335/1532  4.50  3.79  4.01  3.88  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  10  0  0  2  1  9  4.58  306/1504  4.58  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  4  4 15  4.48  532/1612  4.48  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1 21  4.95  331/1635  4.95  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  4  8  7  4.16  772/1579  4.16  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.16


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  1  2  2  4 12  4.14 1175/1518  4.14  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  3  4 14  4.52 1173/1520  4.52  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  2  5  3 11  4.10 1030/1517  4.10  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  2  2  2 14  4.24  912/1550  4.24  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 15  2  0  0  1  2  3.20 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94  3.84  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  1  1  0  9  4.55  403/1398  4.55  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  586/1391  4.55  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  1  0  2  1  6  4.10  918/1388  4.10  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.10
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   3  0  1  0  0  5  4.50  201/ 958  4.50  3.35  3.93  3.71  4.50


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      4        0.00-0.99   1        A    8         Required for Majors   2     Graduate      1        Major        0
  28-55      2        1.00-1.99   0        B    7
  56-83      1        2.00-2.99   1        C    2         General               0     Under-grad   22        Non-major   23
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49   4        D    0
  Grad.      1        3.50-4.00   3        F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                17
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1043
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC         Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL           Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    148
Questionnaires: 60                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   4   6  15  17  16  3.60 1454/1639  3.85  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   3   5  10  16  24  3.91 1244/1639  4.10  4.23  4.22  4.17  3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   1   2   3   1  20  31  4.32  740/1397  4.32  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  22   0   4   4  15  13  4.03  995/1583  3.97  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 21   5   7   6  12   7  3.24 1364/1532  3.48  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 29  2   1   3  13   9  3.93  920/1504  3.71  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   1   4   7  18  27  4.16  924/1612  4.26  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   1   0   2  52   3  3.97 1525/1635  4.05  4.77  4.65  4.56  3.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 19 2  1   1  11  16  10  3.85 1102/1579  3.90  3.98  4.08  3.95  3.85


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   2   2   5  20  26  4.20 1141/1518  4.38  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0   0   1   1  15  37  4.63 1087/1520  4.59  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   6   7   9  19  13  3.48 1354/1517  3.88  4.14  4.27  4.20  3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   1   2   3   4  19  25  4.17  972/1550  3.92  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 22  3   5   5   6  10  3.52  973/1295  3.53  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.52


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  10   5  16  15   8  3.11 1256/1398  3.30  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  11  12  14   6  10  2.85 1355/1391  3.06  3.71  4.30  4.07  2.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  10   4  23   8   7  2.96 1328/1388  3.31  3.79  4.28  4.01  2.96
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  38   4   0   7   2   1  2.71 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  50  7   1   1   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 54 0  1   3   1   1   0  2.33 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 54 4  0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           54  4   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  53  6   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 55 4   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 55 3  2   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    56  2   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                56  2   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 56  0   3   0   0   0   1  2.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       58  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   58  1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 58  1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    57  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      57  0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       57  0   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     57  0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 148
Questionnaires: 60   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   8   0.00-0.99   2   A   10   Required for Majors 13   Graduate   1   Major   1
 28-55   5   1.00-1.99   0   B   23
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   3   C   11   General   1   Under-grad 59   Non-major   59
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
 Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   2   F   1   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   30
                                           ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201                University of Maryland                                      Page 1044
Title       PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC            Baltimore County                                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     BARADWAJ, RAJAL (Instr. A)        Fall   2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     155
Questionnaires: 91                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    5   0   2   9  15  32  28  3.87 1274/1639  3.85  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     7   0   2   3  12  32  35  4.13  981/1639  4.10  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    7   0   3   2  10  12  57  4.40  661/1397  4.32  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4  32   2   4  10  19  20  3.93 1128/1583  3.97  4.17  4.19  4.01  3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  28   6  10  15  13  13  3.30 1346/1532  3.48  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 43  4   6  11   8  13  3.48 1226/1504  3.71  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             6   0   1   5  13  18  48  4.26  814/1612  4.26  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled                   7   0   2   0   1  79   2  3.94 1540/1635  4.05  4.77  4.65  4.56  3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 1  3   5  13  30  16  3.76 1163/1579  3.90  3.98  4.08  3.95  3.76


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8   0   2   2   5  23  51  4.43  905/1518  4.38  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8   0   2   1   2  12  66  4.67 1019/1520  4.59  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9   0   3   5  22  17  35  3.93 1162/1517  3.88  4.14  4.27  4.20  3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      9   0   4   4  13  14  47  4.17  963/1550  3.92  3.97  4.22  4.17  3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 34  7   5   4  14  16  3.59  938/1295  3.53  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.59


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  12  10  18  15  22  3.32 1186/1398  3.30  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  15   9  21  12  19  3.14 1300/1391  3.06  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  12   8  13  22  21  3.42 1217/1388  3.31  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.42
4. Were special techniques successful                   14 62   4   1   4   2   4  3.07 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   73 11   2   1   1   0   3  3.14 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 82 0   4   1   2   0   2  2.44 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 81 8   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            84  4   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  83  4   1   0   1   0   2  3.50 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 81  9   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 86 4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 86  4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     86  4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 86  4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  86  0   3   0   1   0   1  2.20 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  87  0   1   0   1   0   2  3.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        87  1   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    87  2   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  87  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 86  0   2   0   1   1   1  2.80 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     86  1   1   0   1   0   2  3.50 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       87  2   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        86  1   0   1   1   0   2  3.75 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      87  1   0   1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201                  University of Maryland                        Page 1044
Title          PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC            Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL (Instr. A)        Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    155
Questionnaires: 91                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    16        0.00-0.99   8        A   19         Required for Majors  25      Graduate     0       Major        1
  28-55     4        1.00-1.99   0        B   31
  56-83     5        2.00-2.99   4        C   16         General               2      Under-grad  91       Non-major   90
  84-150    1        3.00-3.49   3        D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2        F    3         Electives             5      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    1                                      responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                40
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201           University of Maryland                              Page 1045
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC         Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL (Instr. B)     Fall  2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    155
Questionnaires: 91                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	2	9	15	32	28	3.87	1274/1639	3.85	4.18	4.27	4.08	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	2	3	12	32	35	4.13	981/1639	4.10	4.23	4.22	4.17	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	3	2	10	12	57	4.40	661/1397	4.32	4.28	4.28	4.18	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	32	2	4	10	19	20	3.93	1128/1583	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.01	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	28	6	10	15	13	13	3.30	1346/1532	3.48	3.79	4.01	3.88	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	43	4	6	11	8	13	3.48	1226/1504	3.71	4.13	4.05	3.78	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	5	13	18	48	4.26	814/1612	4.26	4.34	4.16	4.10	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	2	0	1	79	2	3.94	1540/1635	4.05	4.77	4.65	4.56	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	74	1	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	****/1579	3.90	3.98	4.08	3.95	3.76

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	76	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	****/1518	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	77	0	2	0	0	3	9	4.21	****/1520	4.59	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	77	0	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	****/1517	3.88	4.14	4.27	4.20	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	55	13	3	9	2	3	6	3.00	1440/1550	3.92	3.97	4.22	4.17	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	77	6	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	****/1295	3.53	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.59

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	12	10	18	15	22	3.32	1186/1398	3.30	3.55	4.07	3.85	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	15	9	21	12	19	3.14	1300/1391	3.06	3.71	4.30	4.07	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	12	8	13	22	21	3.42	1217/1388	3.31	3.79	4.28	4.01	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	14	62	4	1	4	2	4	3.07	****/ 958	****	3.35	3.93	3.71	****

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	11	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	****/ 224	****	2.50	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	82	0	4	1	2	0	2	2.44	****/ 240	****	2.86	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	84	4	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.00	4.18	4.25	****

Seminar

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	81	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****

Field Work

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****

Self Paced

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	87	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	87	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201                   University of Maryland                        Page 1045
Title          PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC             Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL (Instr. B)         Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    155
Questionnaires: 91                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    16        0.00-0.99   8       A   19        Required for Majors  25       Graduate     0        Major        1
  28-55     4        1.00-1.99   0       B   31
  56-83     5        2.00-2.99   4       C   16        General               2       Under-grad  91        Non-major   90
  84-150    1        3.00-3.49   3       D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2       F    3        Electives             5       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    1                                      responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                40
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0301           University of Maryland                              Page 1046
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC         Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SLOWIKOWSKI, WI             Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   154
Questionnaires: 75                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   3  17  24  30  4.05 1103/1639  3.85  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   2   4   8  21  40  4.24  877/1639  4.10  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   3  16  22  34  4.16  878/1397  4.32  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  27   0   4   9  17  17  4.00 1010/1583  3.97  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 21   1   3  12  13  25  4.07  722/1532  3.48  3.79  4.01  3.88  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 49  1  2   4   8  10  3.96  872/1504  3.71  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   1  11  17  44  4.38  669/1612  4.26  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0  46  26  4.36 1265/1635  4.05  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 3  1   0  12  25  20  4.09  841/1579  3.90  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.09

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   1   9  12  51  4.50  807/1518  4.38  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0  11  17  45  4.47 1222/1520  4.59  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   5  12  17  40  4.24  896/1517  3.88  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   3   0   9  18  44  4.35  814/1550  3.92  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 43  4  0  10   6   8  3.50  978/1295  3.53  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.50

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  11   7  14  12  23  3.43 1145/1398  3.30  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  11  12  19   8  16  3.09 1309/1391  3.06  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  7   4  26  11  18  3.44 1213/1388  3.31  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.44
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  49   1   2   6   2   5  3.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 60   5   2   1   0   3   4  3.60 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 4  0   3   1   5  3.23 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 63 5  0   1   0   2   4  4.29 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          64   4   2   0   0   1   4  3.71 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 65  8   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 70 2  0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 70 3 0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 71 2  0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   70   3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               71   2   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 71  0   0   0   1   2   1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 71  0   0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      71   2   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  71   2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 72  1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 72 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   72   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     71   1   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      72   1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    72   1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27   23        0.00-0.99    5        A    9          Required for Majors  22      Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55    8        1.00-1.99    1        B   27
 56-83    5        2.00-2.99    5        C   27          General               0      Under-grad   75        Non-major   75
 84-150   1        3.00-3.49   14        D    3
 Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    6        F    0          Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I    0          Other                47
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1047
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                 Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    64
Questionnaires: 36                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  0  9  9 17  4.14 1029/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  1  0  6 10 19  4.28  840/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  8 10 17  4.19  850/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  23  1  1  2  4  5  3.85 1198/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 17  0  1  5  5  8  4.05  737/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 24 1 0 5 2 4 3.67 1116/1504 3.82 4.13 4.05 3.78 3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  0  1  9 25  4.58  408/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1  0  0  0 18 16  4.47 1165/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1 0 4 15 14 4.21 714/1579 4.11 3.98 4.08 3.95 4.21

         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  1  0  2  8 24  4.54  757/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  1  6 28  4.77  855/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  1  0  2 11 21  4.46  661/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  1  0  3  5 26  4.57  556/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 25 1 1 3 0 5 3.70 871/1295 3.57 3.69 3.94 3.84 3.70

         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  5  3  3 10 11  3.59 1077/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 3 6 6 8 8 3.39 1252/1391 3.57 3.71 4.30 4.07 3.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 8 1 7 6 7 3.10 1307/1388 3.65 3.79 4.28 4.01 3.10
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  15  3  1  6  3  2  3.00  841/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.00

         Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31   2  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 3 0 0 2 0 2.20 ****/ 240 **** 2.86 4.11 4.01 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 4 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          33   0  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****

         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** **** 4.58 4.50 ****

         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 3.61 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 3.51 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.60 ****

         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.45 4.54 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      34   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   8   0.00-0.99   2   A   12   Required for Majors   3   Graduate   0   Major   3
 28-55   8   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
 56-83   5   2.00-2.99   6   C   8   General   0   Under-grad   36   Non-major   33
 84-150   3   3.00-3.49   6   D   3
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   5   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   1   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   30
                                         ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1048
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I           Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY   (Instr. A)           Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     65
Questionnaires:  36                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   9  25  4.64  469/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   6  29  4.78  231/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   0   6  29  4.83  216/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   9   0   0   3   7  16  4.50  476/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  2  12   0   2   5   4  11  4.09  707/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  18   0   2   2   3   9  4.19  678/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   0   0   4   4  25  4.64  352/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0   2  32  4.94  397/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11  0   0   0   0   8  17  4.68  234/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.68


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   7  28  4.75  454/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  35  4.97  164/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   2   7  27  4.69  371/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   6  29  4.78  325/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  21   1   2   2   1   8  3.93  709/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.93


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0   0   0   3   8  23  4.59  380/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0   0   0   1   7  26  4.74  417/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2   0   1   1   2   5  25  4.53  631/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.53
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  22   1   2   1   4   4  3.67  658/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.67

              Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    8        0.00-0.99    1      A   20       Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0      Major        2
  28-55   10        1.00-1.99    0      B    7                                   Under-grad   36      Non-major   34
  56-83    0        2.00-2.99    1      C    3       General               1
  84-150   0        3.00-3.49    6      D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   14      F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                28
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1049
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY    (Instr. B)         Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    65
Questionnaires: 36                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  9 25  4.64  469/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  6 29  4.78  231/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  6 29  4.83  216/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   9  0  0  3  7 16  4.50  476/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 12  0  2  5  4 11  4.09  707/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 18 0  2  2  3  9  4.19  678/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  0  0  4  4 25  4.64  352/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  2 32  4.94  397/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 28 0 0 0  0  1  7  4.88 ****/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.68

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        25  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  345/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   27  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 27 0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  405/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     22  4  0  1  1  1  7  4.40  769/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 27 7 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.93

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  3  8 23  4.59  380/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  7 26  4.74  417/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  1  1  2  5 25  4.53  631/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.53
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  22  1  2  1  4  4  3.67  658/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.67

                Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     8        0.00-0.99    1       A   20        Required for Majors   1      Graduate      0        Major        2
  28-55    10        1.00-1.99    0       B    7                                     Under-grad   36        Non-major   34
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    1       C    3        General               1
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49    6       D    0                                     #### - Means there are not enough
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   14       F    0        Electives             0             responses to be significant
                                          P    0
                                          I    0        Other                28
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0301            University of Maryland                        Page 1050
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI               Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      63
Questionnaires: 63                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   22   0   1   2   8  16  14  3.98 1172/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27 4.08  3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    22   0   1   0   3  12  25  4.46  583/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   22   0   1   0   6  10  24  4.37  696/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28 4.18  4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    22  21   1   0   3   8   8  4.10  939/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19 4.01  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 22  14   0   3  10   4  10  3.78 1023/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01 3.88  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 22 30  0   1   4   1   5  3.91 ****/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05 3.78  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            22   0   0   1   3   8  29  4.59  408/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16 4.10  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  22   0   0   0   0  22  19  4.46 1175/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65 4.56  4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 30 0   0   0   5  11  17  4.36  538/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08 3.95  4.36

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        23   0   1   0   2   9  28  4.57  720/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   22   0   1   0   1   7  32  4.68 1006/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24  0   2   0   1  17  19  4.31  833/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     23   0   2   0   3  10  25  4.40  769/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22 4.17  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 23 28  2   0   3   3   4  3.58 ****/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94 3.84  ****

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25  0   7   4  10  10   7  3.16 1241/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07 3.85  3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26  0   9   7  12   3   6  2.73 1366/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30 4.07  2.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0   4   7  12   3  11  3.27 1265/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28 4.01  3.27
4. Were special techniques successful                  26  30   2   0   2   3   0  2.86 ****/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93 3.71  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  58   2   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 59 0   1   0   0   2   1  3.50 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 59 2   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           59   1   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 59   2   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18 4.25  ****

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 62  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.50  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 62   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 62   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       62   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   62   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 62   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 4.60  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 62  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    62   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      62   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       62   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     62   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0301              University of Maryland                    Page 1050
Title           CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      63
Questionnaires:  63                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27   12         0.00-0.99   0        A   21        Required for Majors  2      Graduate     2        Major       2
 28-55   11         1.00-1.99   0        B    8
 56-83    0         2.00-2.99   7        C    5        General              0      Under-grad  61        Non-major  61
 84-150   2         3.00-3.49   5        D    2
 Grad.    2         3.50-4.00   6        F    1        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               34
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0401              University of Maryland                          Page 1051
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                 Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      62
Questionnaires:  34                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  1  4 11 17  4.33  814/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27 4.08  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  1  1  1  7 23  4.52  506/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  1  0  0 16 16  4.39  669/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28 4.18  4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1 14  0  1  4  8  6  4.00 1010/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19 4.01  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 13  0  0  6  6  8  4.10  700/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01 3.88  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 23  0  0  5  2  3  3.80 1010/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05 3.78  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  4  8 20  4.42  603/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16 4.10  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0 17 15  4.47 1175/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65 4.56  4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9  3  0  1  2 10  9  4.23  691/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08 3.95  4.23

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  2  3 27  4.78  397/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0 10 22  4.69 1006/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  2  9 20  4.50  597/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  1  0  4  7 20  4.41  769/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22 4.17  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 19  4  0  2  1  5  3.25 1101/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94 3.84  3.25

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  5  6 10  4  4  2.86 1317/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07 3.85  2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  4  5 12  3  4  2.93 1341/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30 4.07  2.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  3  3  8 11  3  3.29 1262/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28 4.01  3.29
4. Were special techniques successful                  6 21  2  0  2  1  2  3.14 ****/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93 3.71  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  32  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
```

                                  Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27   12       0.00-0.99   1       A    8        Required for Majors  6       Graduate      0       Major         1
 28-55    2       1.00-1.99   1       B   12
 56-83    3       2.00-2.99   4       C   10        General              1       Under-grad   34       Non-major    33
 84-150   1       3.00-3.49   5       D    2
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00   3       F    0        Electives            1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other               22
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0501              University of Maryland                                    Page 1052
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I       Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY                  Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      63
Questionnaires:  26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  2  8  15  4.52   593/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  7  17  4.64   371/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3  6  16  4.52   497/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   9  0  0  0  6  10  4.63   355/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  10  2  1  2  3   6  3.71  1092/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  8  1  0  4  4   7  4.00   824/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  1  1  0  7  15  4.42   617/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  1  23  4.96   331/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  1  0  0  1  5  11  4.59   302/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.59

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  1  0  5  19  4.68   588/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0  25  5.00     1/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  1  8  15  4.48   622/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  1  23  4.88   196/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 13  1  0  3  1   5  3.90   731/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.90

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  2  2  0  5  14  4.17   688/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  1  4  4  2  12  3.87  1088/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  2  3  1  4  12  3.95   989/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  15  1  0  2  0   4  3.86   554/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.86
```

```
                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      3      0.00-0.99   0        A    4        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0        Major        1
 28-55      3      1.00-1.99   0        B   10
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   1        C    3        General               0      Under-grad   26        Non-major   25
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49   0        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3        F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                20
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0601              University of Maryland                           Page 1053
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J   (Instr. A)         Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      65
Questionnaires:  32                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   9   8  14  4.09 1075/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   6   9  15  4.16  959/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   8   4  19  4.25  795/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  13   0   1   4   4  10  4.21  832/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  11   3   2   4   5   7  3.52 1229/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 16  1   1   1   5   8  4.13  747/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   8   7  17  4.28  779/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   0  31  5.00    1/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 2  0   0   2   6  13  4.52  362/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.58

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   2  29  4.88  257/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   7  25  4.78  837/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   2   7  22  4.56  523/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   3   6  23  4.63  500/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 13  2   0   2   3   9  4.06  595/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  4.06

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   4   1   7  12   6  3.50 1106/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   5   6   6   5   7  3.10 1308/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0   6   2   8   6   7  3.21 1282/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  22   1   1   0   4   1  3.43 ****/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3        0.00-0.99   0        A     6      Required for Majors   2      Graduate      0       Major        1
  28-55      2        1.00-1.99   0        B     9
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99   2        C     6      General               1      Under-grad   32       Non-major   31
  84-150     1        3.00-3.49   1        D     2
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   4        F     0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P     0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I     0      Other                23
                                           ?     1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0601           University of Maryland                      Page 1054
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I     Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SONG, YOON J   (Instr. B)       Fall  2007                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    65
Questionnaires: 32                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  9  8 14  4.09 1075/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  2  6  9 15  4.16  959/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  0  8  4 19  4.25  795/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0 13  0  1  4  4 10  4.21  832/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11  3  2  4  5  7  3.52 1229/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 16  1  1  1  5  8  4.13  747/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  8  7 17  4.28  779/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  0 31  5.00    1/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 20 1  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  262/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.58


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        24  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  257/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   24  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  622/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  597/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     22  1  0  1  0  2  6  4.44  716/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26 2  1  0  0  0  3  4.00 ****/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  4.06


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2  0  4  1  7 12  6  3.50 1106/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3  0  5  6  6  5  7  3.10 1308/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  6  2  8  6  7  3.21 1282/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.21
4. Were special techniques successful                    3 22  1  1  0  4  1  3.43 ****/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    3        0.00-0.99   0       A    6       Required for Majors   2     Graduate      0      Major      1
  28-55    2        1.00-1.99   0       B    9
  56-83    0        2.00-2.99   2       C    6       General               1     Under-grad   32      Non-major 31
  84-150   1        3.00-3.49   1       D    2
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   4       F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                23
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0701              University of Maryland                            Page 1055
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    WILSON, MARY C                Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     61
Questionnaires: 32                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1 10 12  8  3.78 1339/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  6 12  5  8  3.41 1522/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  4  2 13  8  5  3.25 1332/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  14  3  1  5  8  1  3.17 1506/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  4  3  2  6  9  3.54 1218/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17 4  0  3  5  3  3.20 1358/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  3  4  8 16  4.09  982/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  9 23  4.72  943/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 2 2  5  7  8  3  3.20 1438/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  3.20


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  5 12 14  4.22 1126/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  3  1  5 22  4.48 1205/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  3  8  4  8  9  3.38 1393/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  3  4  6  8 11  3.63 1289/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 16 9  2  1  1  3  2.19 1269/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  2.19


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  3  8  6 11  3.79  936/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  3  3  7  4 12  3.66 1180/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  3  3  5  9  9  3.62 1148/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.62
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  19  2  2  1  4  1  3.00  841/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.00

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     12       0.00-0.99    4      A    5        Required for Majors   3     Graduate      0       Major         0
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0      B   12
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99    0      C    4        General               0     Under-grad   32       Non-major    32
 84-150     1       3.00-3.49    0      D    3
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3      F    1        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                22
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0801             University of Maryland                        Page 1056
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J                  Fall  2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    65
Questionnaires: 46                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   6  11  13  14  3.67 1409/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   4   2  14  26  4.35  761/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   4   7  10  25  4.22  831/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11   1   3   8   6  17  4.00 1010/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  19   0   3   8   4   9  3.79 1000/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 21   0   1   7   4  10  4.05  802/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   1   1   4  10  27  4.42  617/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   1   0   1  41  4.91  662/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2  0   1   3  20  10  4.15  783/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.15

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   1   0   6  36  4.79  378/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   1   1   6  35  4.74  908/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   1   4  10  28  4.51  584/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   2   0   3   1   8  30  4.55  591/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 22  1   3   3   4   8  3.79  819/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.79

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  14   8  10   5   7  2.61 1347/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  2.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  15   8   9   3   9  2.61 1372/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  2.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0   6   6   9   8  15  3.45 1205/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.45
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  31   6   1   3   1   1  2.17  935/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  2.17

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  38  6   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 39 0  3   2   0   0   2  2.43 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 39 6  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           41  3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 42 2   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    42  2   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                42  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 42  0   2   0   2   0   0  2.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 42  0   0   1   1   1   1  3.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       43  0   0   1   0   0   2  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   43  1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43  1   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 43 0   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    42  0   0   0   4   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      42  2   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       42  3   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     42  3   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0801            University of Maryland                    Page 1056
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                      FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J                   Fall   2007                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     65
Questionnaires: 46                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    14       0.00-0.99   6       A   20      Required for Majors   3    Graduate     0      Major      0
 28-55    10       1.00-1.99   0       B    9
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99   3       C    9      General               1    Under-grad  46      Non-major  46
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49   4       D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00  10       F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    1                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                34
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0901            University of Maryland                        Page 1057
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C  (Instr. A)        Fall  2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    58
Questionnaires: 31                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   3   9  11   7  3.65 1428/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.65
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   1   8  13   7  3.80 1326/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  3.80
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   3   1   8  10   9  3.68 1214/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  3.68
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  14   2   1   4   4   6  3.65 1338/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  3.65
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  17   4   1   3   4   2  2.93 1453/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  2.93
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 19   1   3   1   5   2  3.33 1303/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.33
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   2   8   9  11  3.97 1096/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  3.97
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  13  18  4.58 1080/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.58
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0   3   0  11   7   1  3.14 1455/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  3.32


               Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   2   3   3   9  14  3.97 1269/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.21
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   1   9  20  4.55 1158/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.65
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   2   6   4   9   9  3.57 1324/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  3.72
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   4   3   9  14  4.00 1077/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.13
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 10  1   3   2   6   6  3.72  858/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.72


               Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   1   0   5   5  12  4.17  688/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.17
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   1   2   2   9   9  4.00  983/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0   2   1   5   5   9  3.82 1073/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.82
 4. Were special techniques successful                  8  19   2   0   1   0   1  2.50 ****/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****


               Laboratory
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0  1  0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 0  1  0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    8       0.00-0.99    2      A    8        Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0     Major        0
 28-55    2       1.00-1.99    0      B   13
 56-83    1       2.00-2.99    0      C    5        General              0    Under-grad  31     Non-major   31
 84-150   0       3.00-3.49    2      D    2
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    3      F    1        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other               26
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0901              University of Maryland                          Page 1058
Title         CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   WILSON, MARY C  (Instr. B)          Fall  2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      58
Questionnaires: 31                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  3  9 11  7  3.65 1428/1639  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.08  3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  1  1  8 13  7  3.80 1326/1639  4.26  4.23  4.22  4.17  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  3  1  8 10  9  3.68 1214/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  14  2  1  4  4  6  3.65 1338/1583  4.04  4.17  4.19  4.01  3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 17  4  1  3  4  2  2.93 1453/1532  3.67  3.79  4.01  3.88  2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 19 1 3 1 5  2  3.33 1303/1504  3.82  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  2  8  9 11  3.97 1096/1612  4.36  4.34  4.16  4.10  3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 13 18  4.58 1080/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 0 1 0 2 4 1  3.50 1318/1579  4.11  3.98  4.08  3.95  3.32

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       22   0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  891/1518  4.61  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  23   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  890/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 23 0 0 2 0 3 3  3.88 1199/1517  4.29  4.14  4.27  4.20  3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    21   2  0  1  1  1  5  4.25  897/1550  4.41  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 23 1 0 2 0 2 3  3.86 ****/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.72

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 0 5 5 12  4.17  688/1398  3.73  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 1 2 2 9 9  4.00  983/1391  3.57  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 2 1 5 5 9  3.82 1073/1388  3.65  3.79  4.28  4.01  3.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  19  2  0  1  0  1  2.50 ****/ 958  3.23  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                  Type                      Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     8        0.00-0.99    2        A    8         Required for Majors   2        Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55     2        1.00-1.99    0        B   13
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99    0        C    5         General               0        Under-grad  31        Non-major   31
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49    2        D    2
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    3        F    1         Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                26
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0101           University of Maryland                              Page 1059
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY         Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J                  Fall  2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      59
Questionnaires:  39                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  1  4 14 19  4.34   806/1639  4.27  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  0  6 12 20  4.37   735/1639  4.32  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2  0  0  1  4  8 24  4.49   545/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  6  0  2  5  8 16  4.23   822/1583  4.10  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 19  2  1  5  4  7  3.68  1120/1532  3.73  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 0 3 0 8 15  4.35   537/1504  4.05  4.13  4.05  3.78  4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3  0  0  0  2  7 27  4.69   281/1612  4.51  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0 38  5.00     1/1635  4.94  4.77  4.65  4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0 2 20 8  4.20   725/1579  4.22  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.20


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  1  4 33  4.84   301/1518  4.67  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  1  2  4 31  4.71   961/1520  4.72  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  7  9 20  4.36   768/1517  4.25  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  1  0  0  4  9 23  4.53   614/1550  4.22  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 26  1  0  1  4  5  4.09   581/1295  3.84  3.69  3.94  3.84  4.09


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  3  3 10 20  4.31   582/1398  3.94  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  1  2  3 11 19  4.25   816/1391  3.71  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  3  0  4  9 20  4.19   872/1388  4.08  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.19
4. Were special techniques successful                   4 11  0  1  4  9 10  4.17   399/ 958  3.65  3.35  3.93  3.71  4.17


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   30  7  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 36 0 0 0 1 1  1  4.00  ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 5 0 0 0 0  2  5.00  ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            33  4  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  38  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36  0  0  0  2  1  0  3.33  ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     35  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       35  2  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        35  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      35  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****


                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type             Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     8     0.00-0.99   2     A   14      Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0     Major      2
  28-55     4     1.00-1.99   0     B    8                                Under-grad  39     Non-major 37
  56-83     3     2.00-2.99   4     C   10      General              2
  84-150    1     3.00-3.49   1     D    1
  Grad.     0     3.50-4.00   5     F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P    0                               responses to be significant
                                    I    0      Other               27
                                    ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0201           University of Maryland                              Page 1060
Title         CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY       Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J    (Instr. A)   Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       58
Questionnaires:  33                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  2  4 10 17  4.27  870/1639  4.27  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2 13 18  4.48  550/1639  4.32  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  2  1 12 17  4.27  776/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   6  0  0  7  9 11  4.15  900/1583  4.10  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   9  4  1  2  9  8  3.67 1136/1532  3.73  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 11  1  2  3  7  8  3.90  945/1504  4.05  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  4  4 24  4.63  364/1612  4.51  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1 32  4.97  265/1635  4.94  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0  0  1 10 16  4.56  332/1579  4.22  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.60

         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3 30  4.91  213/1518  4.67  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  3 28  4.84  699/1520  4.72  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  2  6 25  4.70  371/1517  4.25  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  2  3  4 24  4.52  626/1550  4.22  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 19  1  1  2  4  6  3.93  709/1295  3.84  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.93

         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  1  6  8 17  4.18  682/1398  3.94  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  2  0 10 10 11  3.85 1100/1391  3.71  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  1  6  8 18  4.30  802/1388  4.08  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.30
4. Were special techniques successful                   0  21  1  1  2  5  3  3.67  658/ 958  3.65  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.67

         Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25   2  1  1  2  0  2  3.17 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0  0  2  3  1  3.83 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 1 1  0  1  2  1  3.40 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           28   0  1  1  0  1  2  3.40 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28   1  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****

         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0 0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 30  1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    30   0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                29   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****

         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 30   0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30   0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       29   1  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   29   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29   1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****

         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    30   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      30   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       30   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     30   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 33   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   10   0.00-0.99   1   A   14   Required for Majors   2   Graduate   0   Major   4
 28-55   4   1.00-1.99   1   B   9
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   1   C   7   General   0   Under-grad   33   Non-major   29
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   3   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   1   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   26
                                         ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1061
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY         Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J    (Instr. B)         Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     58
Questionnaires: 33                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2   4  10  17  4.27  870/1639  4.27  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2  13  18  4.48  550/1639  4.32  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   2   1  12  17  4.27  776/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6   0   0   7   9  11  4.15  900/1583  4.10  4.17  4.19  4.01  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   4   1   2   9   8  3.67 1136/1532  3.73  3.79  4.01  3.88  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 11  1   2   3   7   8  3.90  945/1504  4.05  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   4   4  24  4.63  364/1612  4.51  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  32  4.97  265/1635  4.94  4.77  4.65  4.56  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 22 0 0  0   0   4   7  4.64  262/1579  4.22  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.60


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        22  0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  213/1518  4.67  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   23  0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  546/1520  4.72  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 23 0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1517  4.25  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     19  2   0   2   0   0  10  4.50  638/1550  4.22  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 23 9 0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/1295  3.84  3.69  3.94  3.84  3.93


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   1   6   8  17  4.18  682/1398  3.94  3.55  4.07  3.85  4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   2   0  10  10  11  3.85 1100/1391  3.71  3.71  4.30  4.07  3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0   0   1   6   8  18  4.30  802/1388  4.08  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.30
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  21   1   1   2   5   3  3.67  658/ 958  3.65  3.35  3.93  3.71  3.67


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25  2   1   1   2   0   2  3.17 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0  0   0   2   3   1  3.83 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 1  1   0   1   2   1  3.40 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           28  0   1   1   0   1   2  3.40 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28  1   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29 2  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0  0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 30 1  0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    30  0   0   0   1   2   0  3.67 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                29  0   0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 30  0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30  0   0   0   1   2   0  3.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       29  1   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   29  2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29  1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.60  ****


           Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0  0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    30  0   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      30  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       30  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     30  0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0201                  University of Maryland                              Page 1061
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SONG, YOON J    (Instr. B)       Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    58
Questionnaires: 33                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    10          0.00-0.99   1        A   14          Required for Majors   2        Graduate     0        Major      4
 28-55     4          1.00-1.99   1        B    9
 56-83     1          2.00-2.99   1        C    7          General               0        Under-grad  33        Non-major 29
 84-150    1          3.00-3.49   2        D    0
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00   1        F    0          Electives             3        #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    1                                         responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                26
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0301            University of Maryland                                    Page 1062
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY         Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                  Fall   2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      62
Questionnaires:  41                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1 14 26  4.61  508/1639  4.27  4.18  4.27 4.08  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  7 33  4.78  220/1639  4.32  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  5 33  4.73  302/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28 4.18  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  10  0  0  4  7 20  4.52  465/1583  4.10  4.17  4.19 4.01  4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  11  1  1  7  8 13  4.03  751/1532  3.73  3.79  4.01 3.88  4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 19  0  1  3  1 16  4.52  351/1504  4.05  4.13  4.05 3.78  4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  4 36  4.85  139/1612  4.51  4.34  4.16 4.10  4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  3 37  4.93  529/1635  4.94  4.77  4.65 4.56  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  0  0  1  6 25  4.75  175/1579  4.22  3.98  4.08 3.95  4.75

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  1  2  5 33  4.71  548/1518  4.67  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  2  5 34  4.78  837/1520  4.72  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  4  6 30  4.59  498/1517  4.25  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  0  3  6 31  4.61  522/1550  4.22  3.97  4.22 4.17  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 22  3  0  1  3 12  4.11  577/1295  3.84  3.69  3.94 3.84  4.11

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  8  4  6 12  9  3.26 1207/1398  3.94  3.55  4.07 3.85  3.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  7  9  7  7  9  3.05 1314/1391  3.71  3.71  4.30 4.07  3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  3  1 12  8 16  3.83 1069/1388  4.08  3.79  4.28 4.01  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  20  0  2  4  3 10  4.11  437/ 958  3.65  3.35  3.93 3.71  4.11


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4       0.00-0.99   0        A    8      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major       1
 28-55     10       1.00-1.99   0        B   15
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99   9        C   12      General              0     Under-grad  41       Non-major  40
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49   6        D    1
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   4        F    0      Electives            3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other               33
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0401              University of Maryland                        Page 1063
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   WILSON, MARY C                Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    54
Questionnaires: 30                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   2   5  13  10  4.03 1117/1639  4.27  4.18  4.27 4.08  4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   1   3   7  12   7  3.70 1388/1639  4.32  4.23  4.22 4.17  3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   1   3  12   7   7  3.53 1262/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28 4.18  3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  12   1   1   6   5   4  3.59 1374/1583  4.10  4.17  4.19 4.01  3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 20   1   0   5   1   2  3.33 1330/1532  3.73  3.79  4.01 3.88  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13  0   1   1   6   8  4.31  560/1504  4.05  4.13  4.05 3.78  4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   1   4   4   9  12  3.90 1175/1612  4.51  4.34  4.16 4.10  3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0  30  5.00    1/1635  4.94  4.77  4.65 4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 2  0   3   8   8   3  3.50 1318/1579  4.22  3.98  4.08 3.95  3.50

         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0   0   3   7  19  4.55  745/1518  4.67  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   1   0   2   9  17  4.41 1264/1520  4.72  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0   2   6   8   6   7  3.34 1402/1517  4.25  4.14  4.27 4.20  3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   2   5   6   6  10  3.59 1303/1550  4.22  3.97  4.22 4.17  3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 22  2   0   3   0   1  2.67 ****/1295  3.84  3.69  3.94 3.84  ****

         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0   1   1   2   9  15  4.29  599/1398  3.94  3.55  4.07 3.85  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0   0   3   6   5  14  4.07  950/1391  3.71  3.71  4.30 4.07  4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0   0   1   2  10  15  4.39  746/1388  4.08  3.79  4.28 4.01  4.39
4. Were special techniques successful                 3  18   1   1   1   4   2  3.56  703/ 958  3.65  3.35  3.93 3.71  3.56

         Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18 4.25  ****

         Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   28   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 3.90  ****

         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 29 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 29 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.79  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 4.60  ****

         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 5.00  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   6   0.00-0.99   1   A   6   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   3
 28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   11
 56-83   3   2.00-2.99   2   C   9   General   0   Under-grad   30   Non-major   27
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   0   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   4   #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P   0   responses to be significant
                                             I   0   Other   23
                                             ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0502              University of Maryland                              Page 1064
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C                  Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  3  5  4  4.08 1082/1639  4.27  4.18  4.27 4.08  4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  5  4  4.08 1029/1639  4.32  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  3  0  4  5  3.92 1074/1397  4.20  4.28  4.28 4.18  3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  1  0  4  2  4.00 1010/1583  4.10  4.17  4.19 4.01  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  1  1  4  3  4.00  774/1532  3.73  3.79  4.01 3.88  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 3 0 3 1  3.29 1330/1504  4.05  4.13  4.05 3.78  3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  1  8  4.33  718/1612  4.51  4.34  4.16 4.10  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  1  0  0 11  4.75  884/1635  4.94  4.77  4.65 4.56  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 4 5 1  3.70 1208/1579  4.22  3.98  4.08 3.95  3.70

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  2  4  5  4.08 1209/1518  4.67  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67 1033/1520  4.72  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  5  5  1  3.50 1347/1517  4.25  4.14  4.27 4.20  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  1  3  4  3  3.58 1303/1550  4.22  3.97  4.22 4.17  3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8 0 2 0 1 1  3.25 1101/1295  3.84  3.69  3.94 3.84  3.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  5  2  3  3.42 1156/1398  3.94  3.55  4.07 3.85  3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  2  2  4  0  4  3.17 1296/1391  3.71  3.71  4.30 4.07  3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 5 0 4  3.45 1205/1388  4.08  3.79  4.28 4.01  3.45
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   7  1  1  1  0  1  2.75  895/ 958  3.65  3.35  3.93 3.71  2.75

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18 4.25  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 3.90  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 4.60  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 5.00  ****
```

Questionnaires: 12   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   5   Required for Majors   1   Graduate   0   Major   2
 28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   5
 56-83   2   2.00-2.99   2   C   1   General   1   Under-grad   12   Non-major   10
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   9
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 152H 0101          University of Maryland                        Page 1065
Title         CALC/ANALY GEOM II-HON       Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   RATHINAM, MURUH (Instr. A)       Fall  2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:   8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  1  3  3  4.00 1138/1639  4.00  4.18  4.27 4.08  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  2  3  4.00 1090/1639  4.00  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  1  0  2  5  4.38  687/1397  4.38  4.28  4.28 4.18  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  4  1  3  3.88 1178/1583  3.88  4.17  4.19 4.01  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 1512/1532  2.33  3.79  4.01 3.88  2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 1  0  0  0  1  3.00 1415/1504  3.00  4.13  4.05 3.78  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  3  1  4  4.13  955/1612  4.13  4.34  4.16 4.10  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65 4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0  5  1  4.17  760/1579  4.33  3.98  4.08 3.95  4.33

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  454/1518  4.88  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  890/1520  4.38  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  1  4  2  3.88 1199/1517  4.44  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  796/1550  4.69  3.97  4.22 4.17  4.69

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  0  2  3  2  3.63 1059/1398  3.63  3.55  4.07 3.85  3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0  0  2  1  5  4.38  719/1391  4.38  3.71  4.30 4.07  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0  3  2  3  4.00  944/1388  4.00  3.79  4.28 4.01  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  7  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 3.71  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 1 0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18 4.25  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                           NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  1  3  3  4.00 1138/1639   4.00  4.18  4.27  4.08  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  3  2  3  4.00 1090/1639   4.00  4.23  4.22  4.17  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  1  0  2  5  4.38  687/1397   4.38  4.28  4.28  4.18  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  4  1  3  3.88 1178/1583   3.88  4.17  4.19  4.01  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5   2  0  0  0  1  2.33 1512/1532   2.33  3.79  4.01  3.88  2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 1  0  0  0  1  3.00 1415/1504   3.00  4.13  4.05  3.78  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  3  1  4  4.13  955/1612   4.13  4.34  4.16  4.10  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1635   5.00  4.77  4.65  4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50  382/1579   4.33  3.98  4.08  3.95  4.33

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1518   4.88  4.46  4.43  4.38  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00 1414/1520   4.38  4.67  4.70  4.61  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1517   4.44  4.14  4.27  4.20  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   1   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1550   4.69  3.97  4.22  4.17  4.69

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   1  0  2  3  2  3.63 1059/1398   3.63  3.55  4.07  3.85  3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0  0  2  1  5  4.38  719/1391   4.38  3.71  4.30  4.07  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  3  2  3  4.00  944/1388   4.00  3.79  4.28  4.01  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   7   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 958   ****  3.35  3.93  3.71  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   1   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 224   ****  2.50  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 240   ****  2.86  4.11  4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 219   ****  ****  4.44  4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215   ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 198   ****  4.00  4.18  4.25  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0101           University of Maryland                              Page 1067
Title      ELEMENTARY CALCULUS           Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  ZWECK, JOHN                 Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     63
Questionnaires:  24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  2  0  2  9 11 4.13 1042/1639  3.88  4.18  4.27 4.08  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  1  3  6 12 4.04 1059/1639  4.02  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  2  0  6  8  8 3.83 1131/1397  3.58  4.28  4.28 4.18  3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   6  2  1  3  6  6 3.72 1282/1583  3.58  4.17  4.19 4.01  3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  2  1  2  7  4 3.63 1168/1532  3.56  3.79  4.01 3.88  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6  4  0  2  5  6 3.53 1200/1504  3.53  4.13  4.05 3.78  3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  3  0  6  7  8 3.71 1305/1612  3.85  4.34  4.16 4.10  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  1  0  0  0 22 4.83  781/1635  4.93  4.77  4.65 4.56  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0  1  3  7  7 4.11  818/1579  3.75  3.98  4.08 3.95  4.11

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  2  5 17 4.63  656/1518  4.26  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0 23 5.00    1/1520  4.89  4.67  4.70 4.61  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  5  8  9 4.09 1036/1517  3.78  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  1  2  6 15 4.46  703/1550  3.99  3.97  4.22 4.17  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12  2  0  4  1  4 3.45 1006/1295  3.40  3.69  3.94 3.84  3.45

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  5  1  2  1  8 3.35 1177/1398  3.47  3.55  4.07 3.85  3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  1  2  1  5  8 4.00  983/1391  4.00  3.71  4.30 4.07  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  3  2  1  6  7 3.63 1143/1388  3.84  3.79  4.28 4.01  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   8  1  2  1  3  2 3.33  786/ 958  3.10  3.35  3.93 3.71  3.33

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15   7  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0  1  1  1  1  3 3.57  202/ 240  3.57  2.86  4.11 4.01  3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 3  0  0  1  0  3 4.50 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18   5  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18   5  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18 4.25  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  3  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 1  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  1  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21   2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21   2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 3.90  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21   0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21   0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21   1  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21   2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21   2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 4.60  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21   0  0  0  1  0  2 4.33 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      21   1  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69 4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       21   2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     21   2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 5.00  ****
```

                                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0201            University of Maryland                                      Page 1068
Title       ELEMENTARY CALCULUS             Baltimore County                                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  MUSCEDERE, MICH                Fall   2007                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     52
Questionnaires:  22                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   3   6   5   1   6  3.05 1595/1639  3.88  4.18  4.27 4.08 3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   3   4   9   4  3.57 1455/1639  4.02  4.23  4.22 4.17 3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   5   5   2   6   3  2.86 1383/1397  3.58  4.28  4.28 4.18 2.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   4   3   3   1   6   4  3.29 1474/1583  3.58  4.17  4.19 4.01 3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   2   6   4   5   3  3.05 1415/1532  3.56  3.79  4.01 3.88 3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  3   2   5   2   2  2.86 1440/1504  3.53  4.13  4.05 3.78 2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   3   0   6   4   8  3.67 1327/1612  3.85  4.34  4.16 4.10 3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0  21  5.00    1/1635  4.93  4.77  4.65 4.56 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 2  3   7   2   2  2.94 1502/1579  3.75  3.98  4.08 3.95 2.94


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   5   5   6   4  3.33 1449/1518  4.26  4.46  4.43 4.38 3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   1   2  18  4.81  802/1520  4.89  4.67  4.70 4.61 4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   2   8   5   5   1  2.76 1487/1517  3.78  4.14  4.27 4.20 2.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   4   5   4   3   6  3.09 1433/1550  3.99  3.97  4.22 4.17 3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 6  2   2   6   1  2.65 1232/1295  3.40  3.69  3.94 3.84 2.65


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   3   2   3   5   2  3.07 1264/1398  3.47  3.55  4.07 3.85 3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   2   3   7   3  3.73 1154/1391  4.00  3.71  4.30 4.07 3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  1   0   5   6   4  3.75 1095/1388  3.84  3.79  4.28 4.01 3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   7   2   1   2   2   1  2.88  883/ 958  3.10  3.35  3.93 3.71 2.88


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1 0  0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 240  3.57  2.86  4.11 4.01 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.43 ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51 ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.54 ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3      0.00-0.99   1        A    0       Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0     Major       0
28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0        B    7                                 Under-grad  22     Non-major  22
56-83      2      2.00-2.99   3        C   10       General              1    Under-grad  22     Non-major  22
84-150     6      3.00-3.49   7        D    1
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1        F    2       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               19
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1069
Title     ELEMENTARY CALCULUS               Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN                     Fall  2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    61
Questionnaires: 24                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  1  2  6 15  4.46  684/1639  3.88  4.18  4.27 4.08  4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   1  0  1  7 15  4.46  600/1639  4.02  4.23  4.22 4.17  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   1  0  3 12  7  4.04  957/1397  3.58  4.28  4.28 4.18  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  13   0  2  1  6  2  3.73 1282/1583  3.58  4.17  4.19 4.01  3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  9  0  2  2  4  6  4.00  774/1532  3.56  3.79  4.01 3.88  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13 0  2  4  4  4  4.20  667/1504  3.53  4.13  4.05 3.78  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   1  0  5  5 12  4.17  903/1612  3.85  4.34  4.16 4.10  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1   0  0  0  1 21  4.95  331/1635  4.93  4.77  4.65 4.56  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1  0  1 11  8  4.19  725/1579  3.75  3.98  4.08 3.95  4.19

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0  1  0  1 21  4.83  330/1518  4.26  4.46  4.43 4.38  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0  0  0  3 20  4.87  648/1520  4.89  4.67  4.70 4.61  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  1  1  7 14  4.48  635/1517  3.78  4.14  4.27 4.20  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   0  0  3  7 13  4.43  729/1550  3.99  3.97  4.22 4.17  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12 0  0  3  4  4  4.09  581/1295  3.40  3.69  3.94 3.84  4.09

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  1  4  4  6  4.00  770/1398  3.47  3.55  4.07 3.85  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0  0  0  4  3  8  4.27  808/1391  4.00  3.71  4.30 4.07  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0  0  4  6  6  4.13  907/1388  3.84  3.79  4.28 4.01  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                 8  12   0  0  3  0  1  3.50 ****/ 958  3.10  3.35  3.93 3.71  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 20  3   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/ 240  3.57  2.86  4.11 4.01  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 2 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.44  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 2 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 2 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 4.12  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 3.51  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    5     0.00-0.99   0          A    2     Required for Majors  3    Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55    4     1.00-1.99   0          B    8
56-83    1     2.00-2.99   2          C   13     General              0    Under-grad  24      Non-major  24
84-150   1     3.00-3.49   5          D    0
Grad.    0     3.50-4.00   2          F    0     Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                              responses to be significant
                                      I    0     Other               20
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 215  0101              University of Maryland                               Page 1070
Title        FINITE MATH FOR INFO S          Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  LAI, CHEN K                     Fall  2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     54
Questionnaires: 27                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   3   4  12   6  3.63 1441/1639  3.63  4.18  4.27  4.35  3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   3   6  13   4  3.59 1447/1639  3.59  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   3  11   6   7  3.63 1238/1397  3.63  4.28  4.28  4.39  3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   3   2   7   9   4  3.36 1458/1583  3.36  4.17  4.19  4.28  3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   1   1   6   9   6  3.78 1012/1532  3.78  3.79  4.01  4.09  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  4   4   5   8   2  3.00 1415/1504  3.00  4.13  4.05  4.09  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   3   4  10  10  4.00 1044/1612  4.00  4.34  4.16  4.21  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   1  15  10  4.35 1280/1635  4.35  4.77  4.65  4.63  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1   4   7   9   1  3.23 1430/1579  3.23  3.98  4.08  4.14  3.23


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   2   1   5  17  4.48  835/1518  4.48  4.46  4.43  4.48  4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   3   4  17  4.58 1129/1520  4.58  4.67  4.70  4.78  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   1   0   4  14   5  3.92 1172/1517  3.92  4.14  4.27  4.34  3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1   2   2   4   6  10  3.83 1198/1550  3.83  3.97  4.22  4.33  3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 17  0   1   2   3   1  3.57  943/1295  3.57  3.69  3.94  4.07  3.57


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  3   1   6   4   3  3.18 1233/1398  3.18  3.55  4.07  4.14  3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  1   2   8   1   4  3.31 1271/1391  3.31  3.71  4.30  4.35  3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  2   2   5   8   3  3.40 1226/1388  3.40  3.79  4.28  4.37  3.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  12  0   1   1   2   0  3.25 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.00  ****


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24   1   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0  0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0  0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           25   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.08  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0  0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.00  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  ****  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  3.24  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  1.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  3.00  ****
```

Title   FINITE MATH FOR INFO S   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: LAI, CHEN K   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 27   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   3   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
56-83   3   2.00-2.99   6   C   14   General   0   Under-grad 27   Non-major   27
84-150   10   3.00-3.49   6   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   26
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0101            University of Maryland                             Page 1071
Title        INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  PITTENGER, ARTH                   Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires: 30                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  2  6  4 17  4.24  899/1639  4.40  4.18  4.27  4.35  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  4  3  9 13  4.07 1044/1639  4.11  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  3  3  1  9 13  3.90 1092/1397  4.41  4.28  4.28  4.39  3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  7  2  1  2  6 12  4.09  953/1583  4.46  4.17  4.19  4.28  4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  8  0  2  2  6 11  4.24  598/1532  4.33  3.79  4.01  4.09  4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0  2  1  7  9  4.21  647/1504  4.38  4.13  4.05  4.09  4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  2  3 10 14  4.24  825/1612  4.47  4.34  4.16  4.21  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  1  0  0  0 12 16  4.57 1087/1635  4.80  4.77  4.65  4.63  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1  1  6 10 10  3.96  955/1579  4.06  3.98  4.08  4.14  3.96


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  1  2  0 25  4.75  454/1518  4.62  4.46  4.43  4.48  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  1  0  3 25  4.79  819/1520  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.78  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  2  3  6 16  4.21  928/1517  4.03  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  2  0  3  5  3 16  4.19  953/1550  4.20  3.97  4.22  4.33  4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 21 1  0  0  3  1  3.60 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94  4.07  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  1  2  2  2  1  3.00 1271/1398  3.06  3.55  4.07  4.14  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0  0  1  1  3  3  4.00  983/1391  3.90  3.71  4.30  4.35  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0  0  2  0  6  2  3.80 1078/1388  4.38  3.79  4.28  4.37  3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   21 7  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.00  ****

              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     28 0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  2.00  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A    6      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major       2
 28-55      7      1.00-1.99   0       B    9
 56-83      7      2.00-2.99   4       C   11      General              0      Under-grad  30      Non-major  28
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49   6       D    1
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   6       F    1      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               27
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0201              University of Maryland                        Page 1072
Title       INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR           Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SHEN, JINGLAI                   Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   36
Questionnaires:  9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44  698/1639  4.40  4.18  4.27  4.35  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   5   3  4.22  886/1639  4.11  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78  261/1397  4.41  4.28  4.28  4.39  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  323/1583  4.46  4.17  4.19  4.28  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  335/1532  4.33  3.79  4.01  4.09  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2   0   0   1   0   6  4.71  208/1504  4.38  4.13  4.05  4.09  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56  439/1612  4.47  4.34  4.16  4.21  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67 1001/1635  4.80  4.77  4.65  4.63  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1   0   0   2   2   3  4.14  783/1579  4.06  3.98  4.08  4.14  4.14


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   1   0   2   6  4.44  891/1518  4.62  4.46  4.43  4.48  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56 1151/1520  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.78  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   1   1   1   1   5  3.89 1193/1517  4.03  4.14  4.27  4.34  3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   1   1   0   1   1   5  4.13 1010/1550  4.20  3.97  4.22  4.33  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  7   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94  4.07  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   2   0   0   1   0  2.00 1384/1398  3.06  3.55  4.07  4.14  2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1391  3.90  3.71  4.30  4.35  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1388  4.38  3.79  4.28  4.37  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.00  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0301              University of Maryland                                    Page 1073
Title       INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                                         FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   LO, JAMES T                   Fall  2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     48
Questionnaires: 24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  2  3  7 12  4.21  939/1639  4.40 4.18  4.27 4.35  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  4  9 10  4.17  948/1639  4.11 4.23  4.22 4.27  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4  8 12  4.33  722/1397  4.41 4.28  4.28 4.39  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  9  0  0  3  8  4  4.07  967/1583  4.46 4.17  4.19 4.28  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3  0  0  4  6 10  4.30  535/1532  4.33 3.79  4.01 4.09  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13 0  1  0  6  3  4.10  770/1504  4.38 4.13  4.05 4.09  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  2  2  4 15  4.39  644/1612  4.47 4.34  4.16 4.21  4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  1 22  4.96  331/1635  4.80 4.77  4.65 4.63  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 1  5  7  5  3.89 1071/1579  4.06 3.98  4.08 4.14  3.89

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  1  1  6 15  4.52  782/1518  4.62 4.46  4.43 4.48  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  3 19  4.86  648/1520  4.76 4.67  4.70 4.78  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  1  3  3  6  9  3.86 1205/1517  4.03 4.14  4.27 4.34  3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  2  4  1 15  4.17  963/1550  4.20 3.97  4.22 4.33  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 19 0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1295  **** 3.69  3.94 4.07  ****

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 1  0  1  2  3  3.86  908/1398  3.06 3.55  4.07 4.14  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0  0  1  1  4  4.50  616/1391  3.90 3.71  4.30 4.35  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  0  0  3  6  4.67  496/1388  4.38 3.79  4.28 4.37  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  18  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 958  **** 3.35  3.93 4.00  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 224  **** 2.50  4.10 4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  **** 2.86  4.11 4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 219  **** ****  4.44 4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  **** ****  4.35 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  **** 4.00  4.18 4.08  ****

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  **** ****  4.58 4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  **** ****  4.52 3.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  **** ****  4.47 **** ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  **** ****  4.47 2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  **** ****  4.16 4.00  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  **** ****  4.04 4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  **** ****  4.05 4.28  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  **** ****  4.75 **** ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2       0.00-0.99   0       A   9       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0       Major      1
28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0       B   5
56-83      5       2.00-2.99   2       C   8       General              7     Under-grad   24       Non-major 23
84-150     4       3.00-3.49   5       D   0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   2       F   0       Electives            2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other               11
```

?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0401              University of Maryland                           Page 1074
Title      INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR           Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   KOGAN, JACOB                  Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    44
Questionnaires:  13              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  391/1639  4.40  4.18  4.27  4.35  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  2  1  5  5  4.00 1090/1639  4.11  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  1  1  0 11  4.62  408/1397  4.41  4.28  4.28  4.39  4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  7  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1583  4.46  4.17  4.19  4.28  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  3  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  535/1532  4.33  3.79  4.01  4.09  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  5  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  367/1504  4.38  4.13  4.05  4.09  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  281/1612  4.47  4.34  4.16  4.21  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1635  4.80  4.77  4.65  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  1  2  2  7  4.25  657/1579  4.06  3.98  4.08  4.14  4.25


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  435/1518  4.62  4.46  4.43  4.48  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  699/1520  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.78  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  2  1  3  7  4.15  982/1517  4.03  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  860/1550  4.20  3.97  4.22  4.33  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0 10  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94  4.07  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8  0  1  1  0  1  2  3.40 1162/1398  3.06  3.55  4.07  4.14  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8  0  2  0  0  1  2  3.20 1289/1391  3.90  3.71  4.30  4.35  3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  7  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  496/1388  4.38  3.79  4.28  4.37  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 8  4  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.00  ****


               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.47  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1075
Title       INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  ROSTAMIAN, ROUB                  Fall  2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires:  22                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  6  4 12  4.27  870/1639  3.84 4.18  4.27 4.35  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  5 14  4.50  517/1639  3.84 4.23  4.22 4.27  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  3 17  4.68  350/1397  4.03 4.28  4.28 4.39  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1 10  0  0  2  0  9  4.64  347/1583  3.76 4.17  4.19 4.28  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  9  0  1  2  4  5  4.08  714/1532  3.52 3.79  4.01 4.09  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  0  1  0  5  8  4.43  466/1504  3.94 4.13  4.05 4.09  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  2  1  3 16  4.50  490/1612  4.10 4.34  4.16 4.21  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  5 17  4.77  855/1635  4.77 4.77  4.65 4.63  4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  5  6  8  4.16  772/1579  3.32 3.98  4.08 4.14  4.16


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  1  0  6 15  4.59  696/1518  4.22 4.46  4.43 4.48  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2  4 16  4.64 1074/1520  4.32 4.67  4.70 4.78  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  3  8 11  4.36  768/1517  3.56 4.14  4.27 4.34  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  2  2 17  4.59  533/1550  3.74 3.97  4.22 4.33  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 14  0  2  1  0  4  3.86  768/1295  3.66 3.69  3.94 4.07  3.86


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/1398  2.29 3.55  4.07 4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/1391  3.14 3.71  4.30 4.35  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/1388  2.41 3.79  4.28 4.37  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  19  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 4.00  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.47  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99    0       A   14      Required for Majors   0    Graduate     1    Major        3
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0       B    5                                 
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99    0       C    2      General               1    Under-grad  21    Non-major   19
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49    3       D    1
 Grad.      1      3.50-4.00    8       F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                20
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1076
Title       INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  LYNN, YEN-MOW                  Fall  2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  3  6  4  1  3.07 1594/1639  3.84  4.18  4.27 4.35  3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  3  5  4  1  2.93 1597/1639  3.84  4.23  4.22 4.27  2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  3  5  4  2  3.20 1337/1397  4.03  4.28  4.28 4.39  3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   7  0  3  3  1  1  3.00 1532/1583  3.76  4.17  4.19 4.28  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  0  3  2  1  1  3.00 1421/1532  3.52  3.79  4.01 4.09  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  1  3  3  3  3.80 1010/1504  3.94  4.13  4.05 4.09  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  1  3  2  6  2  3.36 1451/1612  4.10  4.34  4.16 4.21  3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1635  4.77  4.77  4.65 4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  4  2  6  0  0  2.17 1569/1579  3.32  3.98  4.08 4.14  2.17

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  1  0  4  7  2  3.64 1396/1518  4.22  4.46  4.43 4.48  3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  1  1  3  4  5  3.79 1460/1520  4.32  4.67  4.70 4.78  3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  3  5  5  1  0  2.29 1507/1517  3.56  4.14  4.27 4.34  2.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  3  3  6  2  0  2.50 1491/1550  3.74  3.97  4.22 4.33  2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/1295  3.66  3.69  3.94 4.07  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  3  1  0  1  0  1.80 1393/1398  2.29  3.55  4.07 4.14  1.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  1  2  0  0  1  2.50 1377/1391  3.14  3.71  4.30 4.35  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  2  1  1  1  0  2.20 1380/1388  2.41  3.79  4.28 4.37  2.20
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 4.00  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0301            University of Maryland                           Page 1077
Title          INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    MINKOFF, SUSAN                  Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      40
Questionnaires:  23                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                         NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2 11  9  4.17  977/1639  3.84  4.18  4.27  4.35  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  3  8 10  4.09 1029/1639  3.84  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  4  7 11  4.22  831/1397  4.03  4.28  4.28  4.39  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4  2  2  3  6  6  3.63 1345/1583  3.76  4.17  4.19  4.28  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  3  1  4  3  6  3.47 1258/1532  3.52  3.79  4.01  4.09  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 1  3  3  5  5  3.59 1165/1504  3.94  4.13  4.05  4.09  3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  0  6 15  4.43  589/1612  4.10  4.34  4.16  4.21  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  8 13  4.55 1107/1635  4.77  4.77  4.65  4.63  4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1  3  2 10  4  3.65 1239/1579  3.32  3.98  4.08  4.14  3.65

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  3  7 13  4.43  905/1518  4.22  4.46  4.43  4.48  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  1  1  5 15  4.55 1158/1520  4.32  4.67  4.70  4.78  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  1  4  7 10  4.04 1059/1517  3.56  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  2  6  2 13  4.13 1000/1550  3.74  3.97  4.22  4.33  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6 2  1  5  5  4  3.47  995/1295  3.66  3.69  3.94  4.07  3.47

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 2  0  5  2  0  2.78 1327/1398  2.29  3.55  4.07  4.14  2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 1  1  1  2  4  3.78 1137/1391  3.14  3.71  4.30  4.35  3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 2  1  3  2  0  2.63 1368/1388  2.41  3.79  4.28  4.37  2.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   7  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.00  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  21   1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  4.33  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.61  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2      0.00-0.99    0     A   3      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major        6
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0     B   7
  56-83      4      2.00-2.99    6     C   4      General              1     Under-grad  23       Non-major   17
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49    0     D   0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2     F   0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   1                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               16
                                      ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1078
Title       MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS       Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  SEIDMAN, THOMAS             Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    56
Questionnaires:  24                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   1   2  10  11  4.29   850/1639  4.28  4.18  4.27  4.35  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   3   5   7   8  3.87  1287/1639  3.98  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   1   0   3   8  11  4.22   831/1397  4.15  4.28  4.28  4.39  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  11   0   0   1   7   4  4.25   792/1583  4.06  4.17  4.19  4.28  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   6   1   1   4   3   8  3.94   856/1532  3.80  3.79  4.01  4.09  3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  13   0   0   2   3   5  4.30   568/1504  4.23  4.13  4.05  4.09  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0   0   0   4   8  10  4.27   790/1612  4.18  4.34  4.16  4.21  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00     1/1635  4.80  4.77  4.65  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5   1   3   0   5   9   1  3.28  1412/1579  3.59  3.98  4.08  4.14  3.28


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   1   1   5   8   7  3.86  1331/1518  4.11  4.46  4.43  4.48  3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0   0   0   1   6  14  4.62  1101/1520  4.55  4.67  4.70  4.78  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   3   1   7   6   4  3.33  1405/1517  3.74  4.14  4.27  4.34  3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0   4   3   6   5   3  3.00  1440/1550  3.55  3.97  4.22  4.33  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  19   1   0   0   0   1  3.00  ****/1295  3.55  3.69  3.94  4.07  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17   0   1   1   2   1   2  3.29  1198/1398  3.29  3.55  4.07  4.14  3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17   0   2   1   1   1   2  3.00  1321/1391  3.00  3.71  4.30  4.35  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17   0   1   1   0   2   3  3.71  1108/1388  3.71  3.79  4.28  4.37  3.71
4. Were special techniques successful                17   6   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.00  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                     Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2       0.00-0.99    0      A   11      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0        Major        0
  28-55    10       1.00-1.99    0      B    8
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99    1      C    2      General               1      Under-grad   24        Non-major   24
  84-150    2       3.00-3.49    8      D    1
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5      F    0      Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                17
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0201                University of Maryland                            Page 1079
Title       MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS            Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     MINKOFF, SUSAN                     Fall  2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     59
Questionnaires: 34                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  3  6  4 21  4.26  880/1639  4.28  4.18  4.27 4.35  4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  2  1  8  3 19  4.09 1021/1639  3.98  4.23  4.22 4.27  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  3  8  6 17  4.09  942/1397  4.15  4.28  4.28 4.39  4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0 18  0  3  3  3  7  3.88 1178/1583  4.06  4.17  4.19 4.28  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  1  2  9  7  7  3.65 1144/1532  3.80  3.79  4.01 4.09  3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15 1  0  3  6  9  4.16  713/1504  4.23  4.13  4.05 4.09  4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  1  1  6 11 14  4.09  982/1612  4.18  4.34  4.16 4.21  4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  1  0  0  9 22  4.59 1073/1635  4.80  4.77  4.65 4.63  4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 2  1  4 15  9  3.90 1056/1579  3.59  3.98  4.08 4.14  3.90

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  4  1  7 21  4.36  989/1518  4.11  4.46  4.43 4.48  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  1  0  4  5 23  4.48 1205/1520  4.55  4.67  4.70 4.78  4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  3  5  9 16  4.15  982/1517  3.74  4.14  4.27 4.34  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  3  0  6  6 18  4.09 1033/1550  3.55  3.97  4.22 4.33  4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13 2  1  4 10  3  3.55  953/1295  3.55  3.69  3.94 4.07  3.55

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 1  0  3  1  2  3.43 ****/1398  3.29  3.55  4.07 4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27 0 0  1  0  1  5  4.43 ****/1391  3.00  3.71  4.30 4.35  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0 0  1  2  1  4  4.00 ****/1388  3.71  3.79  4.28 4.37  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  27  5  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 4.00  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.47  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 2 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58 4.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 1 0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52 3.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    32  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 2.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                32  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 4.00  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 4.28  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 ****  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 3.24  ****

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2       0.00-0.99   0       A    8       Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major        8
  28-55    10       1.00-1.99   1       B   12
  56-83     4       2.00-2.99   5       C    8       General               1     Under-grad  34      Non-major   26
  84-150    1       3.00-3.49   5       D    1
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   6       F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                29
                                        ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251H 0101          University of Maryland                         Page 1080
Title       MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS       Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  HOFFMAN, KATHLE              Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires:  16                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  318/1639  4.75  4.18  4.27  4.35  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  149/1639  4.88  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  457/1397  4.56  4.28  4.28  4.39  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   5  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  741/1583  4.30  4.17  4.19  4.28  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   7  0  0  4  3  2  3.78 1023/1532  3.78  3.79  4.01  4.09  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  10  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  701/1504  4.17  4.13  4.05  4.09  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  160/1612  4.81  4.34  4.16  4.21  4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  5   1  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  601/1579  4.30  3.98  4.08  4.14  4.30


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  257/1518  4.88  4.46  4.43  4.48  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  382/1520  4.94  4.67  4.70  4.78  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  1  7  8  4.44  687/1517  4.44  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  351/1550  4.75  3.97  4.22  4.33  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  15  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94  4.07  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  14   0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/1398  ****  3.55  4.07  4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  15   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1391  ****  3.71  4.30  4.35  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/1388  ****  3.79  4.28  4.37  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1081
Title       INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I          Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  PITTENGER, ARTH                    Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3   3   9  4.40  754/1639  4.42  4.18  4.27  4.28  4.40
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   4   3   7  4.21  895/1639  4.25  4.23  4.22  4.20  4.21
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   2   6   6  4.13  906/1397  4.44  4.28  4.28  4.26  4.13
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   4   0   0   0   5   5  4.50  476/1583  4.45  4.17  4.19  4.24  4.50
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   4   5   5  4.07  722/1532  3.94  3.79  4.01  4.05  4.07
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2   0   1   2   5   5  4.08  786/1504  4.27  4.13  4.05  4.12  4.08
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   2   1   5   7  4.13  944/1612  4.37  4.34  4.16  4.12  4.13
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00    1/1635  4.92  4.77  4.65  4.66  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   1   3   4   5  4.00  889/1579  4.26  3.98  4.08  4.07  4.00


               Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   2   2  10  4.57  720/1518  4.33  4.46  4.43  4.39  4.57
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   3  11  4.79  837/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.68  4.79
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   2   3   5   4  3.79 1248/1517  4.13  4.14  4.27  4.23  3.79
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   3   3   1   6  3.57 1306/1550  4.13  3.97  4.22  4.20  3.57
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 9  1   0   0   1   3  4.00  623/1295  3.81  3.69  3.94  3.95  4.00


               Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   2   0   3  4.20  675/1398  3.36  3.55  4.07  4.13  4.20
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0   0   2   2   1  3.80 1124/1391  3.76  3.71  4.30  4.35  3.80
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0   0   1   1   3  4.40  740/1388  4.24  3.79  4.28  4.34  4.40


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A   3       Required for Majors   0       Graduate     0       Major        5
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0        B   5
  56-83     8      2.00-2.99   1        C   4       General               0       Under-grad  15       Non-major   10
  84-150    2      3.00-3.49   3        D   2
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   7        F   0       Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                14
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0201                University of Maryland                            Page 1082
Title       INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I             Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  POTRA, FLORIAN                   Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  4  3  8  4.27  880/1639  4.42  4.18  4.27  4.28  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  2  2  5  6  4.00 1090/1639  4.25  4.23  4.22  4.20  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  1  2 11  4.53  487/1397  4.44  4.28  4.28  4.26  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  6  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  548/1583  4.45  4.17  4.19  4.24  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  4  6  4  4.00  774/1532  3.94  3.79  4.01  4.05  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  3  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  594/1504  4.27  4.13  4.05  4.12  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  1  0  0  5  1  8  4.21  860/1612  4.37  4.34  4.16  4.12  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  463/1635  4.92  4.77  4.65  4.66  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  0  0  1  4  5  4.40  496/1579  4.26  3.98  4.08  4.07  4.40


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  3  2  8  2  3.60 1404/1518  4.33  4.46  4.43  4.39  3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  382/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70  4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  3  7  4  4.07 1042/1517  4.13  4.14  4.27  4.23  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  3  4  7  4.29  875/1550  4.13  3.97  4.22  4.20  4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 10  0  2  1  0  0  2.33 ****/1295  3.81  3.69  3.94  3.95  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  3  0  1  3.00 1271/1398  3.36  3.55  4.07  4.13  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  1  2  0  2  3.60 1192/1391  3.76  3.71  4.30  4.35  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  872/1388  4.24  3.79  4.28  4.34  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  4  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  3.97  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.08  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.30  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  5.00  ****


                          Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0301              University of Maryland                          Page 1083
Title          INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I        Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SURI, MANIL                   Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       32
Questionnaires:   17                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  3  1 13  4.59  529/1639  4.42  4.18  4.27 4.28  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  4 11  4.53  496/1639  4.25  4.23  4.22 4.20  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  2 13  4.65  383/1397  4.44  4.28  4.28 4.26  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  4  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  584/1583  4.45  4.17  4.19 4.24  4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  1  2  5  6  3.75 1046/1532  3.94  3.79  4.01 4.05  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5 0  1  1  1  8  4.45  429/1504  4.27  4.13  4.05 4.12  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76  207/1612  4.37  4.34  4.16 4.12  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  781/1635  4.92  4.77  4.65 4.66  4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0  2  4  7  4.38  517/1579  4.26  3.98  4.08 4.07  4.38

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  1 15  4.82  330/1518  4.33  4.46  4.43 4.39  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  1  0  0  3 13  4.59 1129/1520  4.77  4.67  4.70 4.68  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  2 12  4.53  572/1517  4.13  4.14  4.27 4.23  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  3  2 12  4.53  614/1550  4.13  3.97  4.22 4.20  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9 0  3  1  0  4  3.63  917/1295  3.81  3.69  3.94 3.95  3.63

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  3  0  2  1  2  2.88 1316/1398  3.36  3.55  4.07 4.13  2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  3  4  2  3.89 1076/1391  3.76  3.71  4.30 4.35  3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  3  2  4  4.11  912/1388  4.24  3.79  4.28 4.34  4.11
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  5  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 3.97  ****

             Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      16  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.63  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0        A    5        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major        10
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    6                                                        
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   1        C    6        General              2      Under-grad  17      Non-major     7
 84-150     6      3.00-3.49   4        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   5        F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               15
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 302  0101          University of Maryland                            Page 1084
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II       Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  RATHINAM, MURUH               Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  1  3  6  9  4.05 1103/1639  4.05  4.18  4.27 4.28  4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  5  6  8  4.05 1052/1639  4.05  4.23  4.22 4.20  4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  1  3  7  8  4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.28  4.28 4.26  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   5  1  0  2  7  5  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.17  4.19 4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 7  1  2  1  5  4  3.69 1112/1532  3.69  3.79  4.01 4.05  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 1 1 2 4 6 3.93  920/1504  3.93  4.13  4.05 4.12  3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  2  4 13  4.45  575/1612  4.45  4.34  4.16 4.12  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  0  0  0  4 15  4.79  840/1635  4.79  4.77  4.65 4.66  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1208/1579  3.70  3.98  4.08 4.07  3.70

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  1  3 16  4.75  454/1518  4.75  4.46  4.43 4.39  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  4 15  4.70  992/1520  4.70  4.67  4.70 4.68  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 4 10 4.15  982/1517  4.15  4.14  4.27 4.23  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   1  1  2  1  5 10  4.11 1029/1550  4.11  3.97  4.22 4.20  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 18 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94 3.95  ****

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 2 2 0 2 2 3.00 1271/1398  3.00  3.55  4.07 4.13  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 3 2 2 3.86 1094/1391  3.86  3.71  4.30 4.35  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1056/1388  3.86  3.79  4.28 4.34  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                 13   6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 3.97  ****

                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0      A    3       Required for Majors   0     Graduate      2      Major        16
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0      B    6
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99   1      C   10       General               1     Under-grad   18      Non-major     4
 84-150     6        3.00-3.49   4      D    0
 Grad.      2        3.50-4.00   3      F    0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                18
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 381  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1085
Title        LIN. METH/OPER RESEARC        Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  LO, JAMES T                   Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  1  1  4  4  4  3.64 1428/1639  3.64  4.18  4.27  4.28  3.64
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  1  4  4  5  3.93 1227/1639  3.93  4.23  4.22  4.20  3.93
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  5  4  5  4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.28  4.28  4.26  4.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  7  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  761/1583  4.29  4.17  4.19  4.24  4.29
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  506/1532  4.33  3.79  4.01  4.05  4.33
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  3  0  0  0  6  5  4.45  429/1504  4.45  4.13  4.05  4.12  4.45
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  2  1 11  4.64  340/1612  4.64  4.34  4.16  4.12  4.64
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  1  0  2 11  4.64 1023/1635  4.64  4.77  4.65  4.66  4.64
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  1  1  8  0  0  2.70 1537/1579  2.70  3.98  4.08  4.07  2.70


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  2  3  3  3  3  3.14 1472/1518  3.14  4.46  4.43  4.39  3.14
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  2  0  3  4  5  3.71 1472/1520  3.71  4.67  4.70  4.68  3.71
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2  3  7  1  1  2.71 1493/1517  2.71  4.14  4.27  4.23  2.71
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  1  4  4  3  1  1  2.31 1508/1550  2.31  3.97  4.22  4.20  2.31
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  4  2  5  0  1  2.33 1261/1295  2.33  3.69  3.94  3.95  2.33


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 1207/1398  3.25  3.55  4.07  4.13  3.25
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 1146/1391  3.75  3.71  4.30  4.35  3.75
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/1388  ****  3.79  4.28  4.34  ****

            Laboratory
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.08  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0          0.00-0.99  0       A   9         Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0       Major       11
  28-55    0          1.00-1.99  0       B   4                                                                        
  56-83    3          2.00-2.99  2       C   0         General              8      Under-grad   15       Non-major    4
  84-150   6          3.00-3.49  3       D   0                                                                        
  Grad.    0          3.50-4.00  6       F   0         Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I   0         Other                7
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 404  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1086
Title        INTRO PART DIFF EQ I            Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  LYNN, YEN-MOW                   Fall  2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 26                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  4 10 10  4.04 1117/1639  4.04  4.18  4.27 4.42  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  4  9  6  6  3.46 1497/1639  3.46  4.23  4.22 4.29  3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  3  1  7  2 12  3.76 1170/1397  3.76  4.28  4.28 4.38  3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  12  0  0  5  5  4  3.93 1128/1583  3.93  4.17  4.19 4.31  3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  8  0  2  1  9  5  4.00  774/1532  4.00  3.79  4.01 4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8  1  0  1  7  9  4.28  594/1504  4.28  4.13  4.05 4.20  4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  3  6  7  9  3.77 1273/1612  3.77  4.34  4.16 4.18  3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 25  4.96  265/1635  4.96  4.77  4.65 4.72  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  2  7  8  3  0  2.60 1548/1579  2.60  3.98  4.08 4.21  2.60

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  1  1  3 11  7  3.96 1277/1518  3.96  4.46  4.43 4.51  3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  1  6  6 10  4.09 1400/1520  4.09  4.67  4.70 4.75  4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  4  3  4  7  6  3.33 1405/1517  3.33  4.14  4.27 4.34  3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   1  2  6  6  6  2  3.00 1440/1550  3.00  3.97  4.22 4.24  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 19 3  0  1  1  0  2.00 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94 4.01  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  5  1  3  2  2  2.62 1347/1398  2.62  3.55  4.07 4.23  2.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  6  1  1  3  2  2.54 1375/1391  2.54  3.71  4.30 4.48  2.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 5  2  1  3  2  2.62 1369/1388  2.62  3.79  4.28 4.50  2.62
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   9  1  1  1  1  0  2.50 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93 4.24  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 4.49  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11 4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 1 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44 4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35 4.28  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  23   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18 4.21  ****

            Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    24   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                24   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16 4.02  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04 4.84  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05 4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75 4.71  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58 4.73  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56 4.64  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45 4.85  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51 4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24   0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69 4.85  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     23   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52 4.50  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned              Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2          0.00-0.99    0        A     6        Required for Majors   0      Graduate     15      Major        0
 28-55      0          1.00-1.99    0        B    10
 56-83      0          2.00-2.99    1        C     4        General               5      Under-grad   11      Non-major    26
 84-150     4          3.00-3.49    0        D     0
 Grad.     15          3.50-4.00    6        F     0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P     0                                     responses to be significant
                                             I     0        Other                20
                                             ?     3
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 407  0101                University of Maryland                             Page 1087
Title       MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH            Baltimore County                                   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  HORTA, ARNALDO                   Fall   2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires:   8                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   5   2  4.13 1042/1639  4.13  4.18  4.27 4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  517/1639  4.50  4.23  4.22 4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   6   2  4.25  795/1397  4.25  4.28  4.28 4.38  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   2   3   2  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.17  4.19 4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   0   0   1   3   0  3.75 1046/1532  3.75  3.79  4.01 4.07  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0   0   0   4   1  4.20  667/1504  4.20  4.13  4.05 4.20  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63  364/1612  4.63  4.34  4.16 4.18  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  706/1635  4.88  4.77  4.65 4.72  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   1   6   1  4.00  889/1579  4.00  3.98  4.08 4.21  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   0   4   3  4.13 1189/1518  4.13  4.46  4.43 4.51  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  622/1520  4.88  4.67  4.70 4.75  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   5   2  4.13 1007/1517  4.13  4.14  4.27 4.34  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38  796/1550  4.38  3.97  4.22 4.24  4.38

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   1   0   2   1  3.75  965/1398  3.75  3.55  4.07 4.23  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   1   1   1   1  3.50 1220/1391  3.50  3.71  4.30 4.48  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0   1   1   1   0   1  2.75 1356/1388  2.75  3.79  4.28 4.50  2.75

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10 4.49  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 410  0101            University of Maryland                                      Page 1088
Title       INTRO COMPLEX ANALYSIS        Baltimore County                                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  POTRA, FLORIAN                Fall  2007                                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   2   2   7   5  3.76 1352/1639  3.76  4.18  4.27  4.42  3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   1   8   4   3  3.41 1517/1639  3.41  4.23  4.22  4.29  3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   2   7   3   4  3.41 1296/1397  3.41  4.28  4.28  4.38  3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   8   1   3   1   3   1  3.00 1532/1583  3.00  4.17  4.19  4.31  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   0   3   7   6  4.00  774/1532  4.00  3.79  4.01  4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9  0   2   3   1   2  3.38 1278/1504  3.38  4.13  4.05  4.20  3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   3   1   3   6   4  3.41 1436/1612  3.41  4.34  4.16  4.18  3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1   0   0   0   0  16  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  2   2   6   1   2  2.92 1505/1579  2.92  3.98  4.08  4.21  2.92


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   4   2   5   3   2  2.81 1496/1518  2.81  4.46  4.43  4.51  2.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   1   2   4   9  4.31 1331/1520  4.31  4.67  4.70  4.75  4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   3   4   4   2   3  2.88 1477/1517  2.88  4.14  4.27  4.34  2.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   5   4   2   3   3  2.71 1480/1550  2.71  3.97  4.22  4.24  2.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13  0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94  4.01  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0   3   1   1   0   0  1.60 1394/1398  1.60  3.55  4.07  4.23  1.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0   1   0   3   0   1  3.00 1321/1391  3.00  3.71  4.30  4.48  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0   1   1   3   1  3.67 1130/1388  3.67  3.79  4.28  4.50  3.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  4   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.24  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                     Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0        A    8          Required for Majors   0      Graduate      1      Major        7
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    4
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0        C    2          General               9      Under-grad   16      Non-major   10
  84-150     7        3.00-3.49    3        D    0
  Grad.      1        3.50-4.00    8        F    0          Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    1                                        responses to be significant
                                            I    0          Other                10
                                            ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 426  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1089
Title       INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB           Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: AGHEKSANTERIAN,                 Fall  2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   7   6  4.36   797/1639  4.36  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3  10  4.64   371/1639  4.64  4.23  4.22  4.29  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  ****/1397  ****  4.28  4.28  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   1   2   9  4.67   323/1583  4.67  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8   0   0   2   0   4  4.33   506/1532  4.33  3.79  4.01  4.07  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0   0   3   1   3  4.00   824/1504  4.00  4.13  4.05  4.20  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   2  11  4.71   259/1612  4.71  4.34  4.16  4.18  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   0  13  4.86   736/1635  4.86  4.77  4.65  4.72  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   1   3   7  4.55   342/1579  4.55  3.98  4.08  4.21  4.55


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   0  13  4.86   286/1518  4.86  4.46  4.43  4.51  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   0   2  11  4.64  1060/1520  4.64  4.67  4.70  4.75  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   2   1  11  4.64   428/1517  4.64  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   3   1  10  4.50   638/1550  4.50  3.97  4.22  4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2  0   0   1   1   9  4.73   150/1295  4.73  3.69  3.94  4.01  4.73


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   0   1   3  4.75   260/1398  4.75  3.55  4.07  4.23  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0   0   0   2   2  4.50   616/1391  4.50  3.71  4.30  4.48  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/1388  ****  3.79  4.28  4.50  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.24  ****


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 224  ****  2.50  4.10  4.49  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.28  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****  4.00  4.18  4.21  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.83  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.49  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.02  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.84  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.71  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.73  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.64  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.85  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.85  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  4.50  ****
```

Title   INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: AGHEKSANTERIAN,   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   11   Required for Majors 0   Graduate   1   Major   8
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   1   C   0   General   6   Under-grad 13   Non-major   6
84-150   7   3.00-3.49   5   D   0
Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   6
                                        ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 430  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1090
Title        MATRIX ANALYSIS                  Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  CAMPBELL, ROBER (Instr. A)        Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires: 16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  5  6  5  4.00 1138/1639  4.00 4.18  4.27 4.42  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  2  5  4  4  3.67 1410/1639  3.67 4.23  4.22 4.29  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  3  5  8  4.31  740/1397  4.31 4.28  4.28 4.38  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  5  0  2  2  3  4  3.82 1219/1583  3.82 4.17  4.19 4.31  3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  5  0  1  3  4  3.08 1412/1532  3.08 3.79  4.01 4.07  3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  491/1504  4.40 4.13  4.05 4.20  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  3  5  7  4.13  955/1612  4.13 4.34  4.16 4.18  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1635  5.00 4.77  4.65 4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  1  5  5  1  3.50 1318/1579  3.50 3.98  4.08 4.21  3.50

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  2  3  3  8  4.06 1216/1518  4.06 4.46  4.43 4.51  4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  1  3 12  4.69 1006/1520  4.69 4.67  4.70 4.75  4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  3  5  3  4  3.38 1393/1517  3.38 4.14  4.27 4.34  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  2  1  4  5  4  3.50 1328/1550  2.63 3.97  4.22 4.24  2.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2  3  0  2  5  3  3.38 1044/1295  3.38 3.69  3.94 4.01  3.38

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  1  0  2  3  0  3.17 1237/1398  3.17 3.55  4.07 4.23  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83 1106/1391  3.83 3.71  4.30 4.48  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  1  2  3  2  3.75 1095/1388  3.75 3.79  4.28 4.50  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  5  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 958  **** 3.35  3.93 4.24  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0        A    7        Required for Majors  0    Graduate    1     Major      12
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0        B    2                                                    
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99   1        C    5        General              3    Under-grad  15    Non-major   4
  84-150    8       3.00-3.49   3        D    0                                                    
  Grad.     1       3.50-4.00   6        F    0        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               10
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 430  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1091
Title       MATRIX ANALYSIS                 Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:              (Instr. C)            Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      32
Questionnaires:  16                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   5   6   5  4.00 1138/1639  4.00  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   2   5   4   4  3.67 1410/1639  3.67  4.23  4.22  4.29  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   5   8  4.31  740/1397  4.31  4.28  4.28  4.38  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   0   2   2   3   4  3.82 1219/1583  3.82  4.17  4.19  4.31  3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   5   0   1   3   4  3.08 1412/1532  3.08  3.79  4.01  4.07  3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0   0   2   2   6  4.40  491/1504  4.40  4.13  4.05  4.20  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   3   5   7  4.13  955/1612  4.13  4.34  4.16  4.18  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  16  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00

             Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     8   5   0   3   0   0   0  2.00 ****/1550  2.63  3.97  4.22  4.24  2.63

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  1   0   2   3   0  3.17 1237/1398  3.17  3.55  4.07  4.23  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0   1   1   2   2  3.83 1106/1391  3.83  3.71  4.30  4.48  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0   1   2   3   2  3.75 1095/1388  3.75  3.79  4.28  4.50  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  5   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.24  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                   Type                      Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99   0          A    7          Required for Majors   0       Graduate      1        Major      12
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0          B    2                                        Under-grad   15        Non-major   4
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99   1          C    5          General               3
 84-150     8        3.00-3.49   3          D    0                                        #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.      1        3.50-4.00   6          F    0          Electives             1                responses to be significant
                                            P    0
                                            I    0          Other                10
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 441  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1092
Title      INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS           Baltimore County                                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   GOBBERT, MATTHI (Instr. A)       Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55   572/1639  4.55  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55   476/1639  4.55  4.23  4.22  4.29  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1397  5.00  4.28  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   2   8  4.80   186/1583  4.80  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7   0   1   1   1   1  3.50  1241/1532  3.50  3.79  4.01  4.07  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0   0   1   1   5  4.57   313/1504  4.57  4.13  4.05  4.20  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70   281/1612  4.70  4.34  4.16  4.18  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   0   4   6  4.60   283/1579  4.60  3.98  4.08  4.21  4.60


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78   416/1518  4.78  4.46  4.43  4.51  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   597/1520  4.89  4.67  4.70  4.75  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   2   3   3  4.13  1007/1517  4.13  4.14  4.27  4.34  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   2   0   0   1   2   6  4.56   580/1550  3.02  3.97  4.22  4.24  3.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0   0   2   1   6  4.44   313/1295  4.44  3.69  3.94  4.01  4.44


              Discussion
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  9  0  0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/1388  ****  3.79  4.28  4.50  ****
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 441  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1093
Title       INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS         Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                (Instr. C)          Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55   572/1639  4.55 4.18  4.27 4.42  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55   476/1639  4.55 4.23  4.22 4.29  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1397  5.00 4.28  4.28 4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   186/1583  4.80 4.17  4.19 4.31  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7  0  1  1  1  1  3.50  1241/1532  3.50 3.79  4.01 4.07  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  3  0  0  1  1  5  4.57   313/1504  4.57 4.13  4.05 4.20  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   281/1612  4.70 4.34  4.16 4.18  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1635  5.00 4.77  4.65 4.72  5.00

              Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   3  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/1550  3.02 3.97  4.22 4.24  3.02

              Discussion
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/1388  **** 3.79  4.28 4.50  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 441  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1094
Title      INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS             Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:               (Instr. D)             Fall   2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires:  11                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55   572/1639  4.55  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55   476/1639  4.55  4.23  4.22  4.29  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1397  5.00  4.28  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   2   8  4.80   186/1583  4.80  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7   0   1   1   1   1  3.50  1241/1532  3.50  3.79  4.01  4.07  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0   0   1   1   5  4.57   313/1504  4.57  4.13  4.05  4.20  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70   281/1612  4.70  4.34  4.16  4.18  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/1518  4.78  4.46  4.43  4.51  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   2   0   3   0   1   0  2.50  1491/1550  3.02  3.97  4.22  4.24  3.02

             Discussion
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/1388  ****  3.79  4.28  4.50  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 476  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1095
Title         INTRO TO GAME THEORY        Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   ARMSTRONG, THOM             Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires: 15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  5  9  4.53  582/1639  4.53  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  5  4  5  3.87 1287/1639  3.87  4.23  4.22  4.29  3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  973/1397  4.00  4.28  4.28  4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4  1  0  2  3  5  4.00 1010/1583  4.00  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  1  0  5  1  6  3.85  957/1532  3.85  3.79  4.01  4.07  3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  3  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  429/1504  4.45  4.13  4.05  4.20  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  1  4  9  4.33  718/1612  4.33  4.34  4.16  4.18  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1  1  8  3  4.00  889/1579  4.00  3.98  4.08  4.21  4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  684/1518  4.60  4.46  4.43  4.51  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  837/1520  4.79  4.67  4.70  4.75  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  1  3  4  6  3.87 1205/1517  3.87  4.14  4.27  4.34  3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  2  2  4  4  3.43 1360/1550  3.43  3.97  4.22  4.24  3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4  0  0  3  5  3  4.00  623/1295  4.00  3.69  3.94  4.01  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  2  0  1  0  1  2.50 1357/1398  2.50  3.55  4.07  4.23  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  1  2  0  0  1  2.50 1377/1391  2.50  3.71  4.30  4.48  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1  1  0  2  1  3.20 1282/1388  3.20  3.79  4.28  4.50  3.20
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.24  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  2.86  4.11  4.26  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.83  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.49  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    14   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.02  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.84  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.71  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.73  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.64  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.85  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.85  ****

                            Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0      A    6       Required for Majors  1    Graduate      4     Major        6
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B    5
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99   0      C    2       General             10    Under-grad   11     Non-major    9
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49   1      D    0
 Grad.      4       3.50-4.00   4      F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                              responses to be significant
I    0              Other          3
?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 479  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1096
Title          MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S        Baltimore County                           FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    ARMSTRONG, TIMO (Instr. A)     Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  5                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   754/1639  4.40  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   199/1639  4.80  4.23  4.22  4.29  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  2  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1397  5.00  4.28  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   697/1583  4.33  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1532  ****  3.79  4.01  4.07  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 1 2 4.67  245/1504  4.67  4.13  4.05  4.20  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  1  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1612  5.00  4.34  4.16  4.18  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40  496/1579  4.40  3.98  4.08  4.21  4.40


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1518  5.00  4.46  4.43  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1520  ****  4.67  4.70  4.75  ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.14  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  1328/1550  3.08  3.97  4.22  4.24  3.08


              Discussion
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1388  ****  3.79  4.28  4.50  ****


              Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          4  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.28  ****


              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.02  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 479  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1097
Title       MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S          Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:               (Instr. D)             Fall   2007                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  5                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   3   2  4.40   754/1639   4.40  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   199/1639   4.80  4.23  4.22  4.29  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1397   5.00  4.28  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   697/1583   4.33  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1532   ****  3.79  4.01  4.07  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   245/1504   4.67  4.13  4.05  4.20  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1612   5.00  4.34  4.16  4.18  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1635   5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00


               Discussion
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/1388   ****  3.79  4.28  4.50  ****


               Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            4   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 215   ****  ****  4.35  4.28  ****


               Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80   ****  ****  4.47  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  82   ****  ****  4.16  4.02  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 486  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1098
Title         INTRO TO DYNAMICAL SYS        Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   HOFFMAN, KATHLE               Fall  2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   257/1639  4.80  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   199/1639  4.80  4.23  4.22  4.29  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1397  5.00  4.28  4.28  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   186/1583  4.80  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  2  1  4.00   774/1532  4.00  3.79  4.01  4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 0 3  5.00     1/1504  5.00  4.13  4.05  4.20  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   166/1612  4.80  4.34  4.16  4.18  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80   137/1579  4.80  3.98  4.08  4.21  4.80


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1518  5.00  4.46  4.43  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1520  5.00  4.67  4.70  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5  5.00     1/1517  5.00  4.14  4.27  4.34  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1550  5.00  3.97  4.22  4.24  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 1 0 0 0 2  3.67   894/1295  3.67  3.69  3.94  4.01  3.67


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00   ****/1398  ****  3.55  4.07  4.23  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00   ****/1391  ****  3.71  4.30  4.48  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67   496/1388  4.67  3.79  4.28  4.50  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.24  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 601  0101                University of Maryland                            Page 1099
Title      MEASURE THEORY                         Baltimore County                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:  GOWDA, MUDDAPPA                       Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   12
Questionnaires:   9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  188/1639  4.89  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  231/1639  4.78  4.23  4.22  4.26  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  367/1397  4.67  4.28  4.28  4.37  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   4  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  186/1583  4.80  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 1046/1532  3.75  3.79  4.01  4.10  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  130/1504  4.86  4.13  4.05  4.29  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  575/1612  4.44  4.34  4.16  4.27  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  175/1579  4.75  3.98  4.08  4.17  4.75


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  242/1518  4.89  4.46  4.43  4.49  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.67  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  275/1517  4.78  4.14  4.27  4.32  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1550  5.00  3.97  4.22  4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1295  ****  3.69  3.94  3.95  ****


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1398  ****  3.55  4.07  4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1391  ****  3.71  4.30  4.47  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1388  ****  3.79  4.28  4.49  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 620  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1100
Title      NUMERICAL ANALYSIS I             Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   DRAGANESCU, AND               Fall   2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:  7                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies           Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  726/1639  4.43  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  650/1639  4.43  4.23  4.22  4.26  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  447/1397  4.57  4.28  4.28  4.37  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  572/1583  4.43  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  0  2  1  1  3.20 1378/1532  3.20  3.79  4.01  4.10  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  491/1504  4.40  4.13  4.05  4.29  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  139/1612  4.86  4.34  4.16  4.27  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  473/1579  4.43  3.98  4.08  4.17  4.43


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  286/1518  4.86  4.46  4.43  4.49  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57 1136/1520  4.57  4.67  4.70  4.79  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  700/1517  4.43  4.14  4.27  4.32  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  401/1550  4.71  3.97  4.22  4.23  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  1  5  1  4.00  623/1295  4.00  3.69  3.94  3.95  4.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  1  1  0  3.00 1271/1398  3.00  3.55  4.07  4.22  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 1177/1391  3.67  3.71  4.30  4.47  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  2  1  0  3.33 1248/1388  3.33  3.79  4.28  4.49  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   5  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.01  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.39  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 621  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1101
Title          NUMERICAL ANALYSIS II       Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    GOBBERT, MATTHI (Instr. A)      Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
Questionnaires: 5                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20   951/1639  4.20  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  1090/1639  4.00  4.23  4.22  4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  0  3  4.00   973/1397  4.00  4.28  4.28  4.37  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   597/1583  4.40  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   146/1532  4.80  3.79  4.01  4.10  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   291/1504  4.60  4.13  4.05  4.29  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   388/1612  4.60  4.34  4.16  4.27  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80  1133/1579  3.80  3.98  4.08  4.17  3.80

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80  1351/1518  3.80  4.46  4.43  4.49  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1520  5.00  4.67  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  1  0  3  4.00  1083/1517  4.00  4.14  4.27  4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  3  1  1  3.60  1297/1550  2.53  3.97  4.22  4.23  2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  1  0  0  0  4  4.20   505/1295  4.20  3.69  3.94  3.95  4.20

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00   770/1398  4.00  3.55  4.07  4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   616/1391  4.50  3.71  4.30  4.47  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   496/1388  4.67  3.79  4.28  4.49  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.01  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 621  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1102
Title       NUMERICAL ANALYSIS II          Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                (Instr. B)          Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  5                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   0   3  4.20   951/1639  4.20  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   1   2  4.00  1090/1639  4.00  4.23  4.22  4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   0   3  4.00   973/1397  4.00  4.28  4.28  4.37  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   597/1583  4.40  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   146/1532  4.80  3.79  4.01  4.10  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   1   0   4  4.60   291/1504  4.60  4.13  4.05  4.29  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   0   4  4.60   388/1612  4.60  4.34  4.16  4.27  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.81  5.00

            Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   2   0   0   0  2.00  1518/1550  2.53  3.97  4.22  4.23  2.53


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00   770/1398  4.00  3.55  4.07  4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   616/1391  4.50  3.71  4.30  4.47  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67   496/1388  4.67  3.79  4.28  4.49  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.01  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 621  0101                  University of Maryland                                Page 1103
Title       NUMERICAL ANALYSIS II                 Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                    (Instr. D)              Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  5                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   0   3  4.20   951/1639  4.20  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   1   2  4.00  1090/1639  4.00  4.23  4.22  4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   0   3  4.00   973/1397  4.00  4.28  4.28  4.37  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   597/1583  4.40  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   146/1532  4.80  3.79  4.01  4.10  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   1   0   4  4.60   291/1504  4.60  4.13  4.05  4.29  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   0   4  4.60   388/1612  4.60  4.34  4.16  4.27  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.81  5.00

                Lecture
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   2   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/1550  2.53  3.97  4.22  4.23  2.53


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00   770/1398  4.00  3.55  4.07  4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   616/1391  4.50  3.71  4.30  4.47  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67   496/1388  4.67  3.79  4.28  4.49  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.01  ****


                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 625  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1104
Title           COMP MATH & C PROG          Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     ROSTAMIAN, ROUB (Instr. A)  Fall   2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires: 4                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  890/1639  4.25  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  252/1639  4.75  4.23  4.22  4.26  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1397  5.00  4.28  4.28  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  239/1583  4.75  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  1  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 1501/1532  2.50  3.79  4.01  4.10  2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1504  5.00  4.13  4.05  4.29  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  317/1612  4.67  4.34  4.16  4.27  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 1001/1635  4.67  4.77  4.65  4.81  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  175/1579  4.75  3.98  4.08  4.17  4.75

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  454/1518  4.75  4.46  4.43  4.49  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.67  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.14  4.27  4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  638/1550  3.25  3.97  4.22  4.23  3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  135/1295  4.75  3.69  3.94  3.95  4.75

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  625/1398  4.25  3.55  4.07  4.22  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 1146/1391  3.75  3.71  4.30  4.47  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 1095/1388  3.75  3.79  4.28  4.49  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  3  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  951/ 958  1.00  3.35  3.93  4.01  1.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 625  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1105
Title           COMP MATH & C PROG         Baltimore County                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                   (Instr. C)         Fall   2007                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       6
Questionnaires:   4                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  0  0  3  4.25   890/1639  4.25 4.18  4.27 4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75   252/1639  4.75 4.23  4.22 4.26  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1397  5.00 4.28  4.28 4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75   239/1583  4.75 4.17  4.19 4.31  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   1  0  0  1  0  2.50  1501/1532  2.50 3.79  4.01 4.10  2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1504  5.00 4.13  4.05 4.29  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67   317/1612  4.67 4.34  4.16 4.27  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67  1001/1635  4.67 4.77  4.65 4.81  4.67


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   625/1398  4.25 3.55  4.07 4.22  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  1146/1391  3.75 3.71  4.30 4.47  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  1095/1388  3.75 3.79  4.28 4.49  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   3   1  0  0  0  0  1.00   951/ 958  1.00 3.35  3.93 4.01  1.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 710  0101             University of Maryland                               Page 1106
Title       SPEC TOPICS IN APPL MA         Baltimore County                                    FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:   SHEN, JINGLAI                Fall  2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires:  5                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  2  3  4.60  508/1639  4.60  4.18  4.27  4.42  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  3  2  4.40  684/1639  4.40  4.23  4.22  4.26  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  3  2  4.40  661/1397  4.40  4.28  4.28  4.37  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0  0  1  1  2  4.25  792/1583  4.25  4.17  4.19  4.31  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0  0  1  0  3  4.50  335/1532  4.50  3.79  4.01  4.10  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  150/1504  4.80  4.13  4.05  4.29  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  166/1612  4.80  4.34  4.16  4.27  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  884/1635  4.75  4.77  4.65  4.81  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  2  2  1  3.80 1133/1579  3.80  3.98  4.08  4.17  3.80

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  360/1518  4.80  4.46  4.43  4.49  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.67  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  299/1517  4.75  4.14  4.27  4.32  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  288/1550  4.80  3.97  4.22  4.23  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1290/1295  1.50  3.69  3.94  3.95  1.50

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  0  2  1  4.33  560/1398  4.33  3.55  4.07  4.22  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67  489/1391  4.67  3.71  4.30  4.47  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1388  5.00  3.79  4.28  4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 958  ****  3.35  3.93  4.01  ****
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 799  2801                  University of Maryland                            Page 1107
Title       MASTER THESIS RESEARCH              Baltimore County                                 FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    SHEN, JINGLAI                    Fall   2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1639   5.00  4.18  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1639   5.00  4.23  4.22  4.26  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1532   5.00  3.79  4.01  4.10  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1504   5.00  4.13  4.05  4.29  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   889/1579 4.00  3.98  4.08  4.17  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1518   5.00  4.46  4.43  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1520   5.00  4.67  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1517   5.00  4.14  4.27  4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1550   5.00  3.97  4.22  4.23  5.00


                Discussion
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/ 958   5.00  3.35  3.93  4.01  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 898  0801            University of Maryland                          Page 1108
Title          PRE CANDIDACY DOCT RES     Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    KOGAN, JACOB    (Instr. A)      Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      1
Questionnaires:  1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1639  5.00  4.18  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1639  5.00  4.23  4.22  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1583  5.00  4.17  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1532  5.00  3.79  4.01  4.10  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00   1/1504  5.00  4.13  4.05  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00   1/1579  5.00  3.98  4.08  4.17  5.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1518  5.00  4.46  4.43  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1520  5.00  4.67  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1   5.00   1/1517  5.00  4.14  4.27  4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1550  4.67  3.97  4.22  4.23  4.50

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Title       PRE CANDIDACY DOCT RES                   Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:                 (Instr. C)                  Fall   2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      1
Questionnaires:  1                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.18	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.17	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.79	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.13	4.05	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.81	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 898  1801            University of Maryland                          Page 1110
Title          PRE CANDIDACY DOCT RES     Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    POTRA, FLORIAN             Fall   2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires: 1                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1639  5.00  4.18  4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1639  5.00  4.23  4.22  4.26  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1583  5.00  4.17  4.19  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1532  5.00  3.79  4.01  4.10  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1504  5.00  4.13  4.05  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1635  5.00  4.77  4.65  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00  1/1579  5.00  3.98  4.08  4.17  5.00

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1518  5.00  4.46  4.43  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1520  5.00  4.67  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1517  5.00  4.14  4.27  4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1550  4.67  3.97  4.22  4.23  5.00

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1398  5.00  3.55  4.07  4.22  5.00

                                      Frequency Distribution

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