

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 100 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Contemp Math |
| Instructor: | Slowikowski,Wil |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 71 |
| Questionnaires: | 53 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 3.38 | 1527/1589 | 3.38 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 3.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 22 | 4.02 | 1145/1589 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.02 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 18 | 22 | 4.09 | 1010/1391 | 4.09 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.09 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 3.94 | 1154/1552 | 3.94 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.94 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 8 | 3.56 | 1273/1495 | 3.56 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.56 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 34 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 3.26 | 1362/1457 | 3.26 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.26 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 28 | 4.26 | 829/1572 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.26 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 16 | 4.30 | 1304/1589 | 4.30 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.30 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 23 | 8 | 3.83 | 1152/1569 | 3.83 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 32 | 4.40 | 1016/1530 | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 30 | 4.42 | 1332/1533 | 4.42 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.42 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 19 | 17 | 3.88 | 1266/1528 | 3.88 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 3.88 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 26 | 4.20 | 1050/1529 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 3.81 | 965/1393 | 3.81 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.81 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 3.12 | 1263/1337 | 3.12 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.12 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 3.43 | 1232/1331 | 3.43 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.43 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 3.71 | 1171/1333 | 3.71 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.71 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3.87 | 659/1014 | 3.87 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.87 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 100 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 71 |
| Title: | Intro To Contemp Math | | Questionnaires: | 53 |
| Instructor: | Slowikowski, Wil | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 44 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 47 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 47 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 47 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 47 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 45 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 46 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 46 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 46 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 46 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 48 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 47 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 47 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 47 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 47 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 47 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 47 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 100 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Contemp Math |
| Instructor: | Slowikowski,Wil |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 71 |
| Questionnaires: | 53 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 47 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 47 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 17 | 0.00-0.99 3 | A 12 | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 21 | | Major 0 |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 9 | C 14 | General 38 | Under-grad 53 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 1 | | Non-major 53 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 | Electives 0 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 3 | |
| | | | ? 5 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 01 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 59 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 4.15 | 1068/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.15 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 19 | 4.47 | 659/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 23 | 4.57 | 517/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 4.23 | 879/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.20 | 744/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 400/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 21 | 4.53 | 473/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 4.91 | 467/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 4.03 | 933/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.03 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 23 | 4.67 | 644/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 22 | 4.66 | 1114/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.66 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 4.52 | 682/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.52 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 22 | 4.55 | 689/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3.36 | 1214/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.36 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.00 | 823/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 446/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.15 | 946/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.15 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 22 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | ****/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 01 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 59 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 11 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 4 | General | 12 | Under-grad | 35 | Non-major | 35 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 02 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Webb,Deborah P. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 42 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 3.76 | 1384/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 3.76 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 4.04 | 1127/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.04 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 4.25 | 874/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.64 | 1362/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.64 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.86 | 1067/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.86 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.75 | 1129/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 4.13 | 986/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 7 | 4.26 | 1340/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.26 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 3.75 | 1209/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 3.95 | 1352/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 3.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 4.55 | 1229/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.55 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 4.04 | 1147/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.04 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4.22 | 1040/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3.20 | 1268/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.20 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3.29 | 1221/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.29 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.33 | ****/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.50 | ****/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 02 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Webb,Deborah P. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 42 |
| Questionnaires: | 25 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 1 | A 7 | Required for Majors 10 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 9 | | Major 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 6 | General 11 | Under-grad 25 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | Non-major 25 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 1 | F 0 | Electives 0 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 03 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 39 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct | | Questionnaires: | 26 |
| Instructor: | Sharma,Neeraj | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 13 | 4.12 | 1089/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.12 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 4.56 | 525/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 4.19 | 929/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.19 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 3.89 | 1194/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.89 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.00 | 1437/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.13 | 804/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.13 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.24 | 857/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.24 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 4.88 | 519/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4.00 | 957/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 4.80 | 399/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 4.76 | 942/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.76 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 17 | 4.44 | 768/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 22 | 4.80 | 321/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3.86 | 938/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.86 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 23 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 03 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Sharma,Neeraj |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 39 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/178 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/181 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/165 | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 5 | Required for Majors | 5 Graduate 0 Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 7 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 C 4 | General | 7 Under-grad 26 Non-major 26 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 D 1 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 F 0 | Electives | 1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | 0 P 0 | | |
| | | | 0 I 0 | Other | 1 |
| | | | 9 ? 9 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 04 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Potharaju,Pavan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 38 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 4.25 | 957/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 22 | 4.71 | 343/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 4.59 | 493/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.59 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.43 | 636/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.43 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.80 | 1115/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 278/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 4.41 | 647/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.41 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 4.96 | 187/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 4.64 | 257/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.64 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 4.85 | 311/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 4.89 | 643/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 4.85 | 227/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.85 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 24 | 4.81 | 308/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.81 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4.17 | 674/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 3.94 | 884/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.94 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 401/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.73 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.13 | 958/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.13 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 04 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Potharaju,Pavan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 38 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/194 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/178 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 4 | General | 17 | Under-grad | 28 | Non-major | 28 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 05 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 4.19 | 1015/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 4.38 | 790/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 4.52 | 576/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.52 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 4.30 | 795/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4.36 | 587/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 372/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.53 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.38 | 672/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 4.86 | 598/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.86 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 4.29 | 646/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 4.72 | 541/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 4.50 | 1261/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 4.65 | 509/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.65 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.61 | 600/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 4.56 | 299/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.56 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3.93 | 904/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.93 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 3.71 | 1157/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 1007/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.70 | 734/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.70 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 05 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 113/180 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 73/194 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.43 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | ****/178 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 121/181 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.29 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/165 | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 05 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 21 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 06 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 4.41 | 766/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.41 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 4.69 | 378/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 4.59 | 505/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.59 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 4.38 | 706/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 4.20 | 744/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 4.45 | 454/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.45 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 4.41 | 631/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.41 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 280/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 211/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.70 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 4.65 | 677/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.88 | 643/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 4.69 | 449/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 4.35 | 904/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.35 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 4.19 | 651/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.19 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.00 | 823/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.23 | 839/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.23 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4.08 | 986/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.08 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 4.40 | 293/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.40 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 06 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/180 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/194 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/178 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/181 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/165 | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 06 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 3 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 17 |
| 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 responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 07 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4.50 | 646/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4.56 | 540/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 4.56 | 541/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 4.53 | 477/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.56 | 362/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.56 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 4.64 | 268/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 4.56 | 441/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.56 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4.67 | 956/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | 425/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.46 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.59 | 773/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82 | 814/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4.71 | 419/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 4.71 | 474/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 4.57 | 290/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.57 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.60 | 379/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.60 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 4.53 | 599/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 547/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 232/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.54 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 07 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 50/180 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 59/194 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 99/178 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 91/181 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.50 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 53/165 | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | 4.40 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 07 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 41 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 10 | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 2 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 3 | General 7 | Under-grad 18 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 0 | Electives 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 08 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 40 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct | | Questionnaires: | 15 |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4.80 | 253/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 194/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.87 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 142/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.60 | 309/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 90/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.89 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 255/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.73 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 134/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.85 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 294/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.87 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 122/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.93 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 136/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.93 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.55 | 315/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.55 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.36 | 579/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.36 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.50 | 623/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 4.30 | 854/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.30 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 205/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.60 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 08 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 40 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct | | Questionnaires: | 15 |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 23/180 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.78 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/194 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 38/178 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 26/181 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.89 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 14/165 | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | 4.80 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 08 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Riley,Samantha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 40 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 10 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Potharaju,Pavan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 4.17 | 1047/1589 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 4.47 | 674/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 4.55 | 541/1391 | 4.52 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 4.07 | 1030/1552 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 3.89 | 1038/1495 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.89 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 372/1457 | 4.45 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.53 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 4.50 | 495/1572 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.87 | 572/1589 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 4.42 | 495/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.42 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 25 | 4.63 | 694/1530 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 22 | 4.63 | 1140/1533 | 4.74 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 4.53 | 657/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 23 | 4.66 | 544/1529 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.66 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.12 | 731/1393 | 4.06 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.12 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.25 | 663/1337 | 4.05 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.19 | 870/1331 | 4.37 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.19 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.32 | 846/1333 | 4.24 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.32 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 293/1014 | 4.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.40 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 10 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Potharaju,Pavan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/180 | 4.57 | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.22 | 99/194 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.22 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/178 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 21 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/181 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 21 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/165 | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 25 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 26 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 26 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 106 10 |
| Title: | Algebra & Element Funct |
| Instructor: | Potharaju,Pavan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 26 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 26 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 6 | General | 14 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 30 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 131 01 |
| Title: | Math For Elem Tchrs I |
| Instructor: | Tighe,Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.60 | 519/1589 | 4.60 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 4.64 | 422/1589 | 4.64 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.64 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 194/1391 | 4.87 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.87 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 213/1552 | 4.78 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.78 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 330/1495 | 4.58 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.58 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 105/1457 | 4.86 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.86 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 255/1572 | 4.73 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.73 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 730/1589 | 4.80 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.80 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4.36 | 559/1569 | 4.36 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.36 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4.62 | 728/1530 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 469/1533 | 4.92 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 434/1528 | 4.69 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 155/1529 | 4.92 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 586/1393 | 4.25 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 137/1014 | 4.75 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.75 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 131 01 |
| Title: | Math For Elem Tchrs I |
| Instructor: | Tighe,Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 6 | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 2 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 15 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 2 | F 1 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 01 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 127 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 27 | 4.19 | 1015/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 39 | 4.58 | 511/1589 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 32 | 4.34 | 799/1391 | 4.14 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.34 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 20 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 3.86 | 1218/1552 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 18 | 9 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 3.16 | 1422/1495 | 3.46 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.16 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 30 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 13 | 3.96 | 930/1457 | 3.83 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.96 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 30 | 4.11 | 1005/1572 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.11 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 48 | 4.84 | 651/1589 | 4.78 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.84 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 4.02 | 941/1569 | 3.91 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.02 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 39 | 4.53 | 858/1530 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 53 | 4.93 | 469/1533 | 4.77 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 24 | 4.07 | 1129/1528 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.07 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 40 | 4.55 | 689/1529 | 4.34 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 3.54 | 1120/1393 | 3.75 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.54 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 16 | 3.47 | 1155/1337 | 3.42 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.47 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 15 | 10 | 21 | 3.77 | 1133/1331 | 3.50 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.77 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 20 | 3.79 | 1129/1333 | 3.69 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.79 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 23 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 3.41 | 869/1014 | 2.98 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.41 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 01 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 127 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 47 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.50 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 48 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2.89 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 49 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.40 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 49 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 49 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 52 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 52 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 52 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 52 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 52 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 53 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 53 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.25 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 01 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 127 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.25 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 16 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 15 | Required for Majors | 41 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 15 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 57 | Non-major | 57 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 7 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 06 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 81 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 26 | 33 | 3.99 | 1204/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 3.99 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 23 | 33 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 27 | 32 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.14 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 34 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 18 | 13 | 3.85 | 1235/1552 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.85 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 28 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 15 | 14 | 3.42 | 1347/1495 | 3.46 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.42 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 52 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 3.73 | 1146/1457 | 3.83 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.73 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 45 | 4.16 | 949/1572 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.16 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 56 | 4.71 | 920/1589 | 4.78 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 19 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 18 | 17 | 3.58 | 1328/1569 | 3.91 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.58 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 20 | 46 | 4.38 | 1050/1530 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 54 | 4.54 | 1237/1533 | 4.77 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.54 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 20 | 27 | 3.65 | 1371/1528 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 3.65 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 22 | 36 | 4.01 | 1169/1529 | 4.34 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.01 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 24 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 13 | 17 | 3.73 | 1021/1393 | 3.75 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.73 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 20 | 14 | 18 | 3.19 | 1247/1337 | 3.42 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.19 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 19 | 11 | 19 | 3.22 | 1262/1331 | 3.50 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.22 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 18 | 18 | 3.49 | 1236/1333 | 3.69 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.49 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 49 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2.38 | 1001/1014 | 2.98 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 2.38 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 06 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 81 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 74 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.83 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 74 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.14 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 74 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 75 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.75 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 75 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 79 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 79 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 79 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 06 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 81 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 79 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 21 | 0.00-0.99 | 4 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 57 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 29 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 21 | General | 9 | Under-grad | 81 | Non-major | 81 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 7 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 2 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 8 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 11 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Kelly,Brian |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 58 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 35 | 4.38 | 819/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 32 | 4.33 | 865/1589 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 9 | 30 | 4.09 | 1016/1391 | 4.14 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.09 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 22 | 4.18 | 932/1552 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.18 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 32 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 3.81 | 1115/1495 | 3.46 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.81 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 29 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 3.79 | 1095/1457 | 3.83 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.79 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 35 | 4.41 | 631/1572 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.41 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 46 | 4.79 | 768/1589 | 4.78 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.79 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 24 | 18 | 4.14 | 841/1569 | 3.91 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.14 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 39 | 4.48 | 912/1530 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 47 | 4.84 | 786/1533 | 4.77 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.84 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 32 | 4.35 | 883/1528 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 34 | 4.45 | 795/1529 | 4.34 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 18 | 3.98 | 830/1393 | 3.75 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.98 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 18 | 14 | 3.58 | 1101/1337 | 3.42 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.58 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 18 | 3.51 | 1219/1331 | 3.50 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.51 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 23 | 3.80 | 1124/1333 | 3.69 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 32 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 3.14 | 934/1014 | 2.98 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.14 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 11 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Kelly,Brian |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 58 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 54 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 55 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 55 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 55 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 56 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 56 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 56 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 56 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 56 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 56 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 56 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 56 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 150 11 |
| Title: | Precalculus Mathematics |
| Instructor: | Kelly,Brian |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 58 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 56 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 56 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 14 | 0.00-0.99 | 4 | A | 18 | Required for Majors | 41 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 21 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 11 | General | 10 | Under-grad | 58 | Non-major | 57 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 2 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 1 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 01 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Tighe,Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 171 |
| Questionnaires: | 99 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 28 | 57 | 4.39 | 793/1589 | 3.86 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.39 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 69 | 4.55 | 540/1589 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 66 | 4.48 | 626/1391 | 3.84 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 34 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 35 | 4.31 | 782/1552 | 3.82 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.31 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 18 | 11 | 28 | 3.75 | 1153/1495 | 3.57 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 52 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 24 | 4.26 | 670/1457 | 3.89 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.26 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 67 | 4.62 | 378/1572 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 17 | 4.18 | 1416/1589 | 4.60 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.18 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 31 | 43 | 4.29 | 658/1569 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 76 | 4.72 | 541/1530 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 85 | 4.87 | 700/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.87 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 71 | 4.57 | 607/1528 | 3.72 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 78 | 4.66 | 530/1529 | 3.93 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.66 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 22 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 41 | 4.21 | 620/1393 | 3.57 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.21 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 21 | 25 | 37 | 3.96 | 874/1337 | 3.95 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.96 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 21 | 25 | 29 | 3.64 | 1184/1331 | 3.64 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.64 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 28 | 22 | 29 | 3.64 | 1196/1333 | 3.75 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.64 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 38 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 17 | 3.69 | 739/1014 | 3.65 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.69 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 01 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Tighe, Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 171 |
| Questionnaires: | 99 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 30 | 0.00-0.99 | 6 | A | 51 | Required for Majors | 76 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 20 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 20 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 17 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 99 | Non-major | 94 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 45 | F | 1 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 8 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 06 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 166 |
| Questionnaires: | 86 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 25 | 42 | 4.23 | 976/1589 | 3.86 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.23 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 23 | 52 | 4.45 | 689/1589 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.45 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 24 | 45 | 4.27 | 855/1391 | 3.84 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.27 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 25 | 25 | 4.06 | 1045/1552 | 3.82 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.06 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 26 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 3.71 | 1183/1495 | 3.57 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 42 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 20 | 3.98 | 919/1457 | 3.89 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.98 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 23 | 47 | 4.33 | 748/1572 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 60 | 4.64 | 983/1589 | 4.60 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.64 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 29 | 28 | 4.19 | 779/1569 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.19 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 59 | 4.57 | 787/1530 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 77 | 4.88 | 643/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 28 | 46 | 4.35 | 883/1528 | 3.72 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 60 | 4.53 | 714/1529 | 3.93 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 16 | 33 | 3.99 | 819/1393 | 3.57 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.99 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 19 | 31 | 3.83 | 971/1337 | 3.95 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 24 | 13 | 24 | 3.47 | 1225/1331 | 3.64 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.47 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 23 | 29 | 3.97 | 1025/1333 | 3.75 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.97 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 28 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 21 | 3.77 | 700/1014 | 3.65 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.77 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 06 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 166 |
| Questionnaires: | 86 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 77 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4.11 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 76 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 76 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3.71 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 78 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 80 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 80 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 80 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 80 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 81 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 80 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 80 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 80 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 80 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 79 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 79 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 06 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 166 |
| Questionnaires: | 86 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 79 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 80 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 34 | 0.00-0.99 6 | A 41 | Required for Majors 71 | Graduate 0 Major 3 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 26 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 12 | General 9 | Under-grad 86 Non-major 83 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 7 | D 2 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 18 | F 0 | Electives 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 11 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 160 |
| Questionnaires: | 88 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 26 | 41 | 4.05 | 1153/1589 | 3.86 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.05 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 29 | 39 | 4.13 | 1072/1589 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 29 | 44 | 4.20 | 929/1391 | 3.84 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 28 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 18 | 25 | 3.92 | 1175/1552 | 3.82 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.92 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 24 | 3.67 | 1209/1495 | 3.57 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 46 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 17 | 3.98 | 919/1457 | 3.89 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.98 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 48 | 4.22 | 885/1572 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.22 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 72 | 4.78 | 787/1589 | 4.60 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.78 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 14 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 34 | 20 | 3.92 | 1068/1569 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.92 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 60 | 4.35 | 1084/1530 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.35 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 67 | 4.67 | 1087/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 16 | 19 | 36 | 3.84 | 1294/1528 | 3.72 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 3.84 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 51 | 4.11 | 1129/1529 | 3.93 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.11 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 21 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 26 | 3.75 | 1007/1393 | 3.57 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 26 | 3.51 | 1139/1337 | 3.95 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.51 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 22 | 11 | 29 | 3.59 | 1203/1331 | 3.64 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.59 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 17 | 29 | 3.73 | 1161/1333 | 3.75 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.73 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 40 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 3.49 | 833/1014 | 3.65 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.49 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: MATH 151 11 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 160 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Calc & Analy Geomtry I | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 88 | | | | |
| Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 80 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 82 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 83 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 83 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 83 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 84 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 85 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 85 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 85 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 85 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 84 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1.75 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 84 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.25 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 84 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 84 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 84 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 82 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3.17 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 82 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 82 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 11 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Baradwaj,Rajala |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 160 |
| Questionnaires: | 88 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 82 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 82 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 25 | 0.00-0.99 3 | A 27 | Required for Majors 62 | Graduate 0 Major 4 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 29 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 17 | General 3 | Under-grad 88 Non-major 84 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 1 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 0 | Electives 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 1 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 11 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 16 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Kogan,Jacob |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 146 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 2.77 | 1574/1589 | 3.86 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 2.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2.31 | 1584/1589 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 2.31 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2.43 | 1385/1391 | 3.84 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 2.43 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 14 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3.00 | 1518/1552 | 3.82 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 3.13 | 1424/1495 | 3.57 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.13 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 23 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | 1340/1457 | 3.89 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 3.82 | 1247/1572 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.82 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 29 | 4.82 | 677/1589 | 4.60 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.82 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 2.29 | 1561/1569 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 2.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 3.06 | 1507/1530 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 3.06 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 19 | 4.38 | 1361/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.38 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 2.12 | 1524/1528 | 3.72 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 2.12 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2.41 | 1517/1529 | 3.93 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 2.41 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 25 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2.33 | 1377/1393 | 3.57 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 2.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 25 | 4.52 | 444/1337 | 3.95 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.52 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 15 | 3.88 | 1093/1331 | 3.64 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 3.64 | 1200/1333 | 3.75 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.64 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.86 | ****/1014 | 3.65 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 16 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Kogan,Jacob |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 146 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 29 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 29 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.17 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 29 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.50 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 29 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 29 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 31 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 31 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 32 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 32 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 32 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2.60 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 30 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 30 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.75 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151 16 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geomtry I |
| Instructor: | Kogan,Jacob |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 146 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 30 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 18 | 0.00-0.99 | 4 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 25 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 4 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 35 | Non-major | 35 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 3 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 2 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151H 01 |
| Title: | Calc/Analy Geom I-Honors |
| Instructor: | Kogan,Jacob |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 10 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 1182/1589 | 4.00 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3.50 | 1471/1589 | 3.50 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 3.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.88 | 1375/1391 | 2.88 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 2.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.17 | 1502/1552 | 3.17 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 1307/1495 | 3.50 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | 1228/1457 | 3.60 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.88 | 1211/1572 | 3.88 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.88 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.67 | 1277/1569 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4.00 | 1319/1530 | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 1154/1533 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.63 | 1380/1528 | 3.63 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 3.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.13 | 1480/1529 | 3.13 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 3.13 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1251/1393 | 3.25 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.88 | 1093/1331 | 3.88 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 802/1333 | 4.38 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.38 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | 791/1014 | 3.60 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.60 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 151H 01 |
| Title: | Calc/Analy Geom I-Honors |
| Instructor: | Kogan,Jacob |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 10 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 151H 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 10 |
| Title: Calc/Analy Geom I-Honors | | Questionnaires: 8 |
| Instructor: Kogan,Jacob | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 3 | Required for Majors 8 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 4 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 8 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 1 | F 0 | Electives 0 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 152 01 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geometry II |
| Instructor: | Tighe,Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 112 |
| Questionnaires: | 73 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 53 | 4.64 | 463/1589 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 52 | 4.68 | 378/1589 | 4.58 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.68 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 53 | 4.63 | 442/1391 | 4.66 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 29 | 4.39 | 693/1552 | 4.33 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 23 | 3.94 | 971/1495 | 3.89 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.94 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 21 | 4.25 | 680/1457 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 45 | 4.49 | 510/1572 | 4.59 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.49 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 23 | 4.32 | 1294/1589 | 4.64 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.32 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 34 | 4.44 | 453/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.44 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 56 | 4.69 | 593/1530 | 4.80 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 65 | 4.92 | 527/1533 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 47 | 4.58 | 607/1528 | 4.63 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 57 | 4.70 | 474/1529 | 4.70 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.70 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 33 | 4.35 | 489/1393 | 3.78 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.35 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 13 | 18 | 22 | 3.51 | 1139/1337 | 3.95 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.51 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 16 | 13 | 23 | 3.53 | 1215/1331 | 3.81 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 18 | 12 | 29 | 3.82 | 1113/1333 | 3.87 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.82 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 42 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 3.65 | 762/1014 | 3.65 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.65 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 152 01 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geometry II |
| Instructor: | Tighe, Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 112 |
| Questionnaires: | 73 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 152 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 112 |
| Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II | | Questionnaires: 73 |
| Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 5 | A | 24 | Required for Majors | 58 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 14 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 24 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 12 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 73 | Non-major | 61 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 3 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 16 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 152 06 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geometry II |
| Instructor: | Dean,Brian J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 113 |
| Questionnaires: | 60 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 36 | 4.37 | 832/1589 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.37 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 40 | 4.58 | 496/1589 | 4.58 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 49 | 4.75 | 301/1391 | 4.66 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 4.46 | 588/1552 | 4.33 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 4.13 | 814/1495 | 3.89 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.13 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | ****/1457 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 49 | 4.75 | 244/1572 | 4.59 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 49 | 4.84 | 624/1589 | 4.64 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.84 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 21 | 4.31 | 621/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 50 | 4.86 | 294/1530 | 4.80 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 40 | 4.60 | 1189/1533 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.60 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 42 | 4.70 | 419/1528 | 4.63 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 44 | 4.64 | 572/1529 | 4.70 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 2.93 | 1327/1393 | 3.78 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 2.93 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 36 | 4.39 | 557/1337 | 3.95 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.39 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 28 | 4.14 | 919/1331 | 3.81 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.14 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 30 | 3.96 | 1031/1333 | 3.87 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.96 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 152 06 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geometry II |
| Instructor: | Dean, Brian J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 113 |
| Questionnaires: | 60 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 46 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4.10 | ****/1014 | 3.65 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 15 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | A | 31 | Required for Majors | 54 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 18 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 5 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 60 | Non-major | 58 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 152 11 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geometry II |
| Instructor: | Dean,Brian J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 114 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 30 | 4.57 | 569/1589 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 28 | 4.48 | 659/1589 | 4.58 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.48 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 34 | 4.59 | 505/1391 | 4.66 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.59 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 4.14 | 965/1552 | 4.33 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 21 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 3.60 | 1251/1495 | 3.89 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4.00 | 886/1457 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 31 | 4.52 | 473/1572 | 4.59 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.52 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 34 | 4.76 | 825/1589 | 4.64 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.76 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 18 | 4.30 | 634/1569 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.30 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 39 | 4.85 | 329/1530 | 4.80 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 30 | 4.54 | 1229/1533 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.54 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 31 | 4.61 | 570/1528 | 4.63 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.61 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 37 | 4.76 | 382/1529 | 4.70 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.76 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 18 | 4.06 | 769/1393 | 3.78 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.06 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 3.95 | 874/1337 | 3.95 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.95 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 12 | 3.75 | 1141/1331 | 3.81 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 16 | 3.83 | 1113/1333 | 3.87 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.83 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | 3.65 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 152 11 |
| Title: | Calc & Analy Geometry II |
| Instructor: | Dean,Brian J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 114 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 9 | 0.00-0.99 2 | A 15 | Required for Majors 37 | Graduate 0 Major 2 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 21 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 4 | General 1 | Under-grad 46 Non-major 44 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 3 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 2 | F 0 | Electives 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 5 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 155 01 |
| Title: | Applied Calculus |
| Instructor: | Tighe,Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 140 |
| Questionnaires: | 64 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 23 | 24 | 4.02 | 1174/1589 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.02 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 22 | 31 | 4.25 | 943/1589 | 4.48 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 36 | 4.27 | 865/1391 | 4.37 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.27 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 26 | 3.89 | 1194/1552 | 3.99 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.89 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 17 | 19 | 3.92 | 995/1495 | 4.02 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 3.92 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 15 | 17 | 3.71 | 1172/1457 | 3.79 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.71 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 24 | 3.62 | 1360/1572 | 4.03 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 43 | 4.69 | 938/1589 | 4.83 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.69 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 16 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 24 | 13 | 3.94 | 1043/1569 | 4.24 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.94 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 19 | 33 | 4.36 | 1061/1530 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 36 | 4.25 | 1425/1533 | 4.61 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.25 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 34 | 4.34 | 909/1528 | 4.57 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.34 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 35 | 4.25 | 1003/1529 | 4.55 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 3.39 | 1198/1393 | 3.97 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.39 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 3.43 | 1173/1337 | 3.09 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.43 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 22 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 3.38 | 1238/1331 | 3.27 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.38 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 22 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 3.33 | 1271/1333 | 3.38 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.33 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 23 | 26 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.07 | ****/1014 | 4.00 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 155 01 |
| Title: | Applied Calculus |
| Instructor: | Tighe, Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 140 |
| Questionnaires: | 64 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 60 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 62 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 62 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 62 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 62 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 62 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 63 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 63 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 155 01 |
| Title: | Applied Calculus |
| Instructor: | Tighe,Bonny J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 140 |
| Questionnaires: | 64 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 63 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 10 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 21 | Required for Majors | 44 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 22 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 8 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 64 | Non-major | 64 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 11 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 155 05 |
| Title: | Applied Calculus |
| Instructor: | Stanwyck, Elizab |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 129 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 22 | 4.32 | 897/1589 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.32 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 31 | 4.71 | 343/1589 | 4.48 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 28 | 4.47 | 639/1391 | 4.37 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.47 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 4.09 | 1016/1552 | 3.99 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 4.13 | 824/1495 | 4.02 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.13 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 3.87 | 1033/1457 | 3.79 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.87 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 26 | 4.43 | 601/1572 | 4.03 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.43 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 35 | 4.97 | 140/1589 | 4.83 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 4.54 | 336/1569 | 4.24 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.54 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 31 | 4.88 | 259/1530 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 4.97 | 176/1533 | 4.61 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.97 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 29 | 4.79 | 294/1528 | 4.57 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.79 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 32 | 4.86 | 257/1529 | 4.55 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 4.54 | 324/1393 | 3.97 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.54 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 2.75 | 1302/1337 | 3.09 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 2.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 3.16 | 1273/1331 | 3.27 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.16 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 3.42 | 1256/1333 | 3.38 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 3.42 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.00 | 554/1014 | 4.00 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 155 05 |
| Title: | Applied Calculus |
| Instructor: | Stanwyck, Elizab |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 129 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 30 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3.86 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 31 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.71 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.71 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 155 05 |
| Title: | Applied Calculus |
| Instructor: | Stanwyck, Elizab |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 129 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 2 | A 6 | Required for Majors | 31 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 17 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 5 | C 12 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 38 | Non-major | 38 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 3 | D 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 1 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 215 01 |
| Title: | Finite Math For Info Sci |
| Instructor: | Kapoor,Jagmohan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 89 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 11 | 3.91 | 1282/1589 | 3.91 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 17 | 4.21 | 996/1589 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.21 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 22 | 4.48 | 626/1391 | 4.48 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 3.96 | 1133/1552 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 3.96 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 3.92 | 1007/1495 | 3.92 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.92 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 3.83 | 1060/1457 | 3.83 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.83 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 16 | 4.18 | 940/1572 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.18 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 4.56 | 1053/1589 | 4.56 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.56 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 3.80 | 1170/1569 | 3.80 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 3.80 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 20 | 4.32 | 1107/1530 | 4.32 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.32 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 11 | 4.00 | 1476/1533 | 4.00 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 4.07 | 1135/1528 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.07 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.16 | 1081/1529 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.16 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.07 | 758/1393 | 4.07 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.07 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 3.65 | 1070/1337 | 3.65 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.65 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2.70 | 1310/1331 | 2.70 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 2.70 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 2.90 | 1311/1333 | 2.90 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 2.90 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.14 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 215 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 89 |
| Title: | Finite Math For Info Sci | | Questionnaires: | 35 |
| Instructor: | Kapoor,Jagmohan | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 23 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3.00 | 184/194 | 3.00 | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | 3.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.60 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3.40 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.60 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 24 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 24 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.20 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 25 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2.60 | 34/40 | 2.60 | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | 2.60 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 25 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.30 | 31/40 | 3.30 | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | 3.30 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 25 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3.67 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3.18 | 31/39 | 3.18 | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 3.18 |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 24 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4.13 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 24 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 215 01 |
| Title: | Finite Math For Info Sci |
| Instructor: | Kapoor,Jagmohan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 89 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 24 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 24 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 11 | Required for Majors 26 | Graduate 0 Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 12 | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 3 | C 9 | General 3 | Under-grad 35 Non-major 35 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 1 | F 0 | Electives 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Muscedere,Micha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 60 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 24 | 4.38 | 819/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 19 | 4.27 | 922/1589 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.27 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 19 | 4.32 | 809/1391 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.32 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 3.78 | 1287/1552 | 3.84 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 3.78 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 3.74 | 1168/1495 | 4.11 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.74 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 4.13 | 795/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.13 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 4.03 | 1077/1572 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.03 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 3.91 | 1068/1569 | 3.90 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 3.91 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 4.30 | 1137/1530 | 4.36 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.30 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 28 | 4.70 | 1047/1533 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.70 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 17 | 4.00 | 1171/1528 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 20 | 4.08 | 1138/1529 | 4.03 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.08 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 3.59 | 1099/1393 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.59 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3.56 | 1117/1337 | 3.27 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.56 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 3.61 | 1196/1331 | 3.49 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 3.61 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 3.82 | 1113/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 3.82 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/1014 | 4.21 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Muscedere,Micha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 60 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 5 | Required for Majors | 31 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 8 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 18 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 C 9 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 36 | Non-major | 34 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 D 2 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 F 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | ? 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 60 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra | | Questionnaires: | 27 |
| Instructor: | Lo,James T | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 3.44 | 1514/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 3.67 | 1419/1589 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 3.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 3.65 | 1255/1391 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 3.65 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3.06 | 1512/1552 | 3.84 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 3.06 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.41 | 519/1495 | 4.11 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.41 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3.80 | 1087/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 4.37 | 685/1572 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.37 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 4.62 | 1001/1589 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.62 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 1 | 3.29 | 1453/1569 | 3.90 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 3.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 14 | 4.12 | 1273/1530 | 4.36 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.12 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 20 | 4.65 | 1114/1533 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.65 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 3.54 | 1402/1528 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.54 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3.25 | 1459/1529 | 4.03 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 3.25 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.33 | ****/1393 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2.79 | 1298/1337 | 3.27 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 2.79 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2.62 | 1316/1331 | 3.49 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 2.62 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3.15 | 1295/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 3.15 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | 4.21 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 60 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra | | Questionnaires: | 27 |
| Instructor: | Lo,James T | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 24 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 02 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Lo,James T |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 60 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 2 | Required for Majors | 22 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 4 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 25 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 03 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 57 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 29 | 4.43 | 739/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 24 | 4.33 | 865/1589 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 30 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 14 | 4.09 | 1016/1552 | 3.84 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 26 | 4.23 | 723/1495 | 4.11 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.23 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 4.17 | 768/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.17 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 27 | 4.39 | 659/1572 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.39 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 4.93 | 327/1589 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 4.23 | 730/1569 | 3.90 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.23 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 28 | 4.44 | 964/1530 | 4.36 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 4.85 | 757/1533 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.85 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 23 | 4.24 | 1000/1528 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.24 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 24 | 4.26 | 993/1529 | 4.03 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.26 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 24 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3.25 | 1251/1393 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.00 | 823/1337 | 3.27 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 32 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.07 | 967/1331 | 3.49 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.07 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4.21 | 908/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.21 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.21 | 422/1014 | 4.21 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 4.21 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 03 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 57 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 03 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 57 |
| Questionnaires: | 46 |

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|--|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|------------|------|---------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 17 | Required for Majors | 38 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 12 | 2.00-2.99 7 | C 10 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 46 | Non-major | 44 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 12 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 12 | F 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | ? 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 04 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Peercy,Bradford |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 67 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 23 | 4.57 | 569/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 24 | 4.64 | 433/1589 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.64 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 23 | 4.54 | 552/1391 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.73 | 274/1552 | 3.84 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.73 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 4.37 | 564/1495 | 4.11 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.37 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.50 | 400/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 29 | 4.75 | 233/1572 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 4.81 | 730/1589 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.81 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 12 | 4.26 | 694/1569 | 3.90 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.26 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 25 | 4.67 | 644/1530 | 4.36 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 4.89 | 643/1533 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 25 | 4.69 | 434/1528 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 27 | 4.61 | 600/1529 | 4.03 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 3.81 | 965/1393 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.81 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | ****/1337 | 3.27 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | ****/1331 | 3.49 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | ****/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 29 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | 4.21 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 04 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Peercy,Bradford |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 67 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 29 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 8 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 18 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 5 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 37 | Non-major | 30 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221 05 |
| Title: | Intro To Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Potra, Florian A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 57 |
| Questionnaires: | 29 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 4.10 | 1110/1589 | 4.19 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.10 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 4.18 | 1024/1589 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.18 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 18 | 4.45 | 679/1391 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 3.56 | 1401/1552 | 3.84 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 3.56 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 3.78 | 1137/1495 | 4.11 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.78 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4.33 | 593/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 4.21 | 913/1572 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.21 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 187/1589 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 5 | 3.81 | 1170/1569 | 3.90 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 3.81 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 4.30 | 1137/1530 | 4.36 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.30 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 4.88 | 643/1533 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 3.89 | 1266/1528 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 3.93 | 1235/1529 | 4.03 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 3.93 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | ****/1393 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.75 | 1302/1337 | 3.27 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 2.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.67 | 1176/1331 | 3.49 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 3.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.88 | 1085/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 3.88 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 221 05 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 57 |
| Title: Intro To Linear Algebra | | Questionnaires: 29 |
| Instructor: Potra, Florian A | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 20 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.40 | ****/1014 | 4.21 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 10 | Required for Majors 19 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 12 | | Major 1 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 1 | General 0 | Under-grad 29 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 1 | | Non-major 28 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 0 | Electives 1 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 4 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221H 01 |
| Title: | Intro Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Suri,Manil |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 10 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 253/1589 | 4.80 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 356/1589 | 4.70 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 156/1391 | 4.90 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 436/1552 | 4.57 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 508/1495 | 4.43 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 649/1457 | 4.29 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 290/1572 | 4.70 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.70 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 730/1589 | 4.80 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.80 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 369/1569 | 4.50 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 399/1530 | 4.80 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 570/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 615/1529 | 4.60 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 965/1393 | 3.80 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.80 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 1145/1337 | 3.50 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 824/1331 | 4.25 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 221H 01 |
| Title: | Intro Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Suri,Manil |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 10 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 221H 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 13 |
| Title: Intro Linear Algebra | | Questionnaires: 10 |
| Instructor: Suri,Manil | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------------|-----------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | Graduate | Major |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | Under-grad | Non-major |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 225 01 |
| Title: | Intro Differentl Equatns |
| Instructor: | Dean,Brian J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 52 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 4.81 | 243/1589 | 4.37 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 27 | 4.78 | 253/1589 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.78 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 29 | 4.90 | 156/1391 | 4.03 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 341/1552 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.48 | 450/1495 | 4.10 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.48 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.75 | 169/1457 | 4.29 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 27 | 4.87 | 129/1572 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.87 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 4.94 | 327/1589 | 4.90 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 16 | 4.50 | 369/1569 | 3.79 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 29 | 4.90 | 224/1530 | 4.25 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 22 | 4.67 | 1100/1533 | 4.47 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 4.84 | 248/1528 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.84 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 27 | 4.81 | 321/1529 | 3.97 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.81 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 282/1393 | 4.39 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.58 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 225 01 |
| Title: | Intro Differentl Equatns |
| Instructor: | Dean,Brian J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 52 |
| Questionnaires: | 32 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 25 | Required for Majors | 27 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 C 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 22 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 F 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 225 02 |
| Title: | Intro Differentl Equatns |
| Instructor: | Soane,Ana Maria |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 36 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 28 | 4.75 | 316/1589 | 4.37 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 25 | 4.69 | 367/1589 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 28 | 4.77 | 281/1391 | 4.03 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.77 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 4.23 | 879/1552 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 4.00 | 899/1495 | 4.10 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.25 | 680/1457 | 4.29 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 23 | 4.46 | 571/1572 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.46 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 4.91 | 420/1589 | 4.90 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 16 | 4.45 | 439/1569 | 3.79 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.45 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 27 | 4.74 | 505/1530 | 4.25 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 | 4.77 | 924/1533 | 4.47 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.77 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 22 | 4.57 | 607/1528 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 25 | 4.63 | 586/1529 | 3.97 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4.20 | 629/1393 | 4.39 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.20 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 32 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 225 02 |
| Title: | Intro Differentl Equatns |
| Instructor: | Soane,Ana Maria |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 36 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 22 | Required for Majors | 33 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 10 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 C 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 36 | Non-major | 32 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 F 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 225 03 |
| Title: | Intro Differentl Equatns |
| Instructor: | Lo,James T |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 49 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 3.56 | 1483/1589 | 4.37 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 2.93 | 1563/1589 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 2.93 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 2.41 | 1386/1391 | 4.03 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 2.41 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 3.00 | 1518/1552 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3.83 | 1086/1495 | 4.10 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.83 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 3.87 | 1033/1457 | 4.29 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.87 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 3.59 | 1370/1572 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 3.59 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 4.85 | 598/1589 | 4.90 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.85 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 2.42 | 1553/1569 | 3.79 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 2.42 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 3.11 | 1502/1530 | 4.25 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 3.11 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 3.96 | 1485/1533 | 4.47 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 3.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2.74 | 1504/1528 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 2.74 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2.48 | 1516/1529 | 3.97 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 2.48 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.60 | ****/1393 | 4.39 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.83 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 225 03 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 49 |
| Title: Intro Differentl Equatns | | Questionnaires: 27 |
| Instructor: Lo,James T | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 25 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 9 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 4 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 21 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 01 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Kang,Weining |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 54 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 16 | 3.74 | 1397/1589 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 3.31 | 1516/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 3.31 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 3.18 | 1345/1391 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 3.18 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3.76 | 1294/1552 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 3.76 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3.78 | 1137/1495 | 3.84 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.78 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.00 | 886/1457 | 4.44 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 15 | 3.89 | 1204/1572 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 3.89 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 4.94 | 327/1589 | 4.65 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 2.85 | 1532/1569 | 3.75 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 2.85 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 4.09 | 1288/1530 | 4.34 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.09 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 20 | 4.37 | 1367/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.37 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 3.26 | 1461/1528 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.26 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 3.17 | 1472/1529 | 3.98 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 3.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3.11 | 1295/1393 | 3.42 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.11 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | ****/1337 | 3.15 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 30 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/1331 | 3.54 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 01 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Kang,Weining |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 54 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 01 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Kang,Weining |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 54 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 29 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 10 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 2 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 35 | Non-major | 33 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 11 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 02 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Dean,Brian J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 51 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 4.96 | 63/1589 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.96 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.93 | 109/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.93 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.93 | 125/1391 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.93 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 97/1552 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.92 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 3.69 | 1203/1495 | 3.84 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.69 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 4.88 | 95/1457 | 4.44 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.88 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.93 | 78/1572 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.93 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 187/1589 | 4.65 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 4.83 | 139/1569 | 3.75 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 4.34 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 235/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.84 | 238/1528 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.84 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 78/1529 | 3.98 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.96 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.75 | 1000/1393 | 3.42 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/1337 | 3.15 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1331 | 3.54 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 251 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 51 |
| Title: Multivariable Calculus | | Questionnaires: 27 |
| Instructor: Dean, Brian J | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 24 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 22 | Required for Majors | 24 |
| 28-55 | 10 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 3 | C 0 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 03 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Glezen,John |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 49 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.26 | 957/1589 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.26 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 14 | 4.23 | 975/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.23 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 14 | 4.26 | 874/1391 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.26 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 4.26 | 837/1552 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.26 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.04 | 877/1495 | 3.84 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.04 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 4.27 | 670/1457 | 4.44 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 19 | 4.19 | 922/1572 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.19 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 4.90 | 493/1589 | 4.65 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.90 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 4.00 | 957/1569 | 3.75 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 4.39 | 1027/1530 | 4.34 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.39 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 4.93 | 410/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 9 | 3.96 | 1204/1528 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.96 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 4.24 | 1012/1529 | 3.98 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.24 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3.56 | 1110/1393 | 3.42 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.56 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.15 | 1255/1337 | 3.15 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.15 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.54 | 1213/1331 | 3.54 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 3.54 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3.77 | 1145/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 3.77 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 29 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 03 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Glezen,John |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 49 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 15 | Required for Majors 25 | Graduate 0 Major 2 |
| 28-55 | 8 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 6 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 9 | General 0 | Under-grad 31 Non-major 29 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 1 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 1 | F 0 | Electives 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 04 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Chin,Sang H. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 3.71 | 1417/1589 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 3.54 | 1463/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 3.54 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 3.64 | 1260/1391 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 3.64 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 3.83 | 1243/1552 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 3.83 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3.85 | 1076/1495 | 3.84 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.85 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 308/1457 | 4.44 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 3.96 | 1133/1572 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 3.96 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 3.79 | 1557/1589 | 4.65 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 3.79 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 3.33 | 1438/1569 | 3.75 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 3.33 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 3.89 | 1388/1530 | 4.34 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 3.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 18 | 4.54 | 1237/1533 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.54 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 3.48 | 1413/1528 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 3.54 | 1400/1529 | 3.98 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 3.54 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.25 | 1251/1393 | 3.42 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/1337 | 3.15 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/1331 | 3.54 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 251 04 |
| Title: | Multivariable Calculus |
| Instructor: | Chin,Sang H. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1333 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 3 | Required for Majors | 26 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 16 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 C 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 28 | Non-major | 25 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 F 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | MATH 301 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 30 |
| Title: | Intro Math Analysis I | | Questionnaires: | 16 |
| Instructor: | Armstrong,Thoma | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3.67 | 1440/1589 | 4.06 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3.44 | 1489/1589 | 3.80 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3.56 | 1287/1391 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.73 | 1320/1552 | 4.06 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.73 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.64 | 1227/1495 | 3.86 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.64 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.18 | 750/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.18 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3.13 | 1494/1572 | 3.55 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 572/1589 | 4.84 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3.08 | 1496/1569 | 3.42 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.08 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4.20 | 1209/1530 | 3.89 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 4.31 | 1401/1533 | 4.61 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.31 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2.73 | 1505/1528 | 3.21 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 2.73 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.13 | 1478/1529 | 3.47 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.13 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2.83 | 1344/1393 | 2.99 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 2.83 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1337 | 3.38 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 623/1331 | 4.50 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1333 | 4.17 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.41 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 301 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 30 |
| Title: Intro Math Analysis I | | Questionnaires: 16 |
| Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: MATH 301 02 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 24 | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| Title: Intro Math Analysis I | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 14 | | | | | |
| Instructor: Seidman,Thomas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
| Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.14 | 1068/1589 | 4.06 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3.71 | 1393/1589 | 3.80 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.82 | 1259/1552 | 4.06 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.82 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3.85 | 1076/1495 | 3.86 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.85 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.85 | 1051/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.85 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2.85 | 1537/1572 | 3.55 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 2.85 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 901/1589 | 4.84 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2.92 | 1526/1569 | 3.42 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 2.92 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 3.07 | 1505/1530 | 3.89 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 3.07 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 942/1533 | 4.61 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.77 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2.64 | 1510/1528 | 3.21 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 2.64 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.21 | 1466/1529 | 3.47 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.21 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1393 | 2.99 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.10 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.38 | 1191/1337 | 3.38 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.38 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 623/1331 | 4.50 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 939/1333 | 4.17 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.17 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | | 6 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 301 02 |
| Title: | Intro Math Analysis I |
| Instructor: | Seidman,Thomas |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 301 03 |
| Title: | Intro Math Analysis I |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 26 |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 4.38 | 819/1589 | 4.06 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4.25 | 943/1589 | 3.80 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 373/1552 | 4.06 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.08 | 855/1495 | 3.86 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.08 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 354/1457 | 4.19 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.56 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 4.69 | 309/1572 | 3.55 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 327/1589 | 4.84 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.25 | 694/1569 | 3.42 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4.40 | 1016/1530 | 3.89 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 994/1533 | 4.61 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.73 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.27 | 983/1528 | 3.21 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.27 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4.07 | 1147/1529 | 3.47 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3.14 | 1286/1393 | 2.99 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.14 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/1337 | 3.38 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/1331 | 4.50 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/1333 | 4.17 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.41 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 301 03 |
| Title: | Intro Math Analysis I |
| Instructor: | Nanes,Kalman M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 26 |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 2 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 15 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 4 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 302 01 |
| Title: | Intro Math Analysis II |
| Instructor: | Gowda,Muddappa |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 47 |
| Questionnaires: | 36 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 26 | 4.61 | 505/1589 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 4.86 | 172/1589 | 4.86 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 31 | 4.86 | 204/1391 | 4.86 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.63 | 383/1552 | 4.63 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 26 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3.50 | 1307/1495 | 3.50 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.60 | 308/1457 | 4.60 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 4.86 | 129/1572 | 4.86 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 4.94 | 280/1589 | 4.94 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 4.87 | 118/1569 | 4.87 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.87 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 4.88 | 195/1528 | 4.88 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 32 | 4.83 | 295/1529 | 4.83 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.57 | ****/1393 | **** | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.10 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.41 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 302 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 47 |
| Title: Intro Math Analysis II | | Questionnaires: 36 |
| Instructor: Gowda,Muddappa | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 30 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 19 | Required for Majors | 31 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 27 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 4 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 35 | Non-major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 14 | 3.00-3.49 6 | D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 18 | F 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | ? 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | MATH 381 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 20 |
| Title: | Lin. Meth/Oper Research | | Questionnaires: | 11 |
| Instructor: | Guler,Osman | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.27 | 938/1589 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.36 | 815/1589 | 4.36 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.45 | 666/1391 | 4.45 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.40 | 668/1552 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.25 | 693/1495 | 4.25 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.25 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.29 | 649/1457 | 4.29 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | 815/1572 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.27 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 4.27 | 1331/1589 | 4.27 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.27 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3.60 | 1319/1569 | 3.60 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | 1153/1530 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 1140/1533 | 4.64 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.64 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.09 | 1117/1528 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.09 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.09 | 1133/1529 | 4.09 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.20 | 629/1393 | 4.20 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.20 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.41 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 381 01 |
| Title: | Lin. Meth/Oper Research |
| Instructor: | Guler,Osman |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/63 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 381 01 |
| Title: | Lin. Meth/Oper Research |
| Instructor: | Guler,Osman |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 385 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Math Modeling |
| Instructor: | Kang,Weining |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 37 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 3.70 | 1424/1589 | 3.70 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 3.59 | 1448/1589 | 3.59 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.59 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 3.56 | 1289/1391 | 3.56 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.21 | 889/1552 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.21 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3.27 | 1399/1495 | 3.27 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.17 | 768/1457 | 4.17 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.17 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 4.30 | 787/1572 | 4.30 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.30 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 3.50 | 1367/1569 | 3.50 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4.12 | 1273/1530 | 4.12 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.12 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 16 | 4.35 | 1384/1533 | 4.35 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.35 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 3.85 | 1288/1528 | 3.85 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.85 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 3.81 | 1313/1529 | 3.81 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.81 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3.70 | 1036/1393 | 3.70 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.70 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.20 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 385 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Math Modeling |
| Instructor: | Kang,Weining |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 37 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.35 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 9 | Required for Majors 15 | Graduate 1 Major 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 11 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 0 | General 1 | Under-grad 26 Non-major 14 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 6 | D 1 | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 4 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 390 01 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Math |
| Instructor: | Meskin,Stephen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.25 | 1545/1589 | 3.25 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3.33 | 1512/1589 | 3.33 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.33 | 1323/1391 | 3.33 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3.44 | 1449/1552 | 3.44 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.50 | 1307/1495 | 3.50 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.86 | 1042/1457 | 3.86 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.86 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2.33 | 1558/1572 | 2.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 2.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2.78 | 1538/1569 | 2.78 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 2.78 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.25 | 1169/1530 | 4.25 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 1197/1533 | 4.58 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.58 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2.75 | 1504/1528 | 2.75 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 2.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3.17 | 1474/1529 | 3.17 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3.30 | 1234/1393 | 3.30 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.30 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 1204/1337 | 3.33 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 1245/1331 | 3.33 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | 1318/1333 | 2.67 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 2.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 390 01 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Math |
| Instructor: | Meskin,Stephen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.57 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.67 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 4.60 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 390 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 16 |
| Title: Special Topics In Math | | Questionnaires: 12 |
| Instructor: Meskin,Stephen | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 404 01 |
| Title: | Intro Part Diff Eq I |
| Instructor: | Seidman,Thomas |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 17 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.67 | 1440/1589 | 4.14 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 3.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.25 | 1527/1589 | 3.91 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 3.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2.83 | 1377/1391 | 3.76 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 2.83 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | 1327/1552 | 4.07 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 3.71 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2.91 | 1455/1495 | 3.59 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 2.91 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.38 | 1324/1457 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.38 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3.17 | 1490/1572 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 3.17 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 420/1589 | 4.94 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2.78 | 1538/1569 | 3.53 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 2.78 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 1512/1530 | 3.90 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 959/1533 | 4.84 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2.50 | 1514/1528 | 3.52 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 2.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.00 | 1489/1529 | 3.84 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1393 | 3.75 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.33 | 1327/1337 | 3.11 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 2.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 766/1331 | 4.11 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.33 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 404 01 |
| Title: | Intro Part Diff Eq I |
| Instructor: | Seidman,Thomas |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 17 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1190/1333 | 3.83 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 3.67 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 404 02 |
| Title: | Intro Part Diff Eq I |
| Instructor: | Bell,Jonathan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 37 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 4.62 | 505/1589 | 4.14 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 4.58 | 511/1589 | 3.91 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 363/1391 | 3.76 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 4.42 | 636/1552 | 4.07 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.42 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 4.27 | 673/1495 | 3.59 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.76 | 161/1457 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.76 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 4.62 | 378/1572 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 187/1589 | 4.94 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 4.29 | 658/1569 | 3.53 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 4.81 | 399/1530 | 3.90 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4.92 | 469/1533 | 4.84 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 18 | 4.54 | 657/1528 | 3.52 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 18 | 4.68 | 502/1529 | 3.84 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3.75 | 1000/1393 | 3.75 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 3.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.89 | 938/1337 | 3.11 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 3.89 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.89 | 1089/1331 | 4.11 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 3.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1007/1333 | 3.83 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.32 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 404 02 |
| Title: | Intro Part Diff Eq I |
| Instructor: | Bell,Jonathan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 37 |
| Questionnaires: | 26 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.36 | 4.17 | 4.27 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 4.14 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 3.30 | 3.89 | 4.10 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 3.18 | 4.00 | 4.43 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | **** | 4.12 | 4.38 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | **** | 4.42 | 4.51 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 4 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 5 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 24 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 4 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 7 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 9 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 407 01 |
| Title: | Modern Algebra & No.Theo |
| Instructor: | Toll,Charles |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4.13 | 1078/1589 | 4.13 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 3.93 | 1232/1589 | 3.93 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 3.93 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3.73 | 1219/1391 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 3.73 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 4.08 | 1023/1552 | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.08 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4.00 | 899/1495 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4.08 | 835/1457 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.33 | 735/1572 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 863/1589 | 4.73 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.73 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 3.77 | 1201/1569 | 3.77 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 3.77 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.27 | 1161/1530 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 994/1533 | 4.73 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.73 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3.73 | 1341/1528 | 3.73 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 3.73 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4.13 | 1105/1529 | 4.13 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.13 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1393 | **** | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.80 | 1296/1337 | 2.80 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 2.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1284/1331 | 3.00 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 3.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 702/1333 | 4.50 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 407 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 20 |
| Title: Modern Algebra & No.Theo | | Questionnaires: 15 |
| Instructor: Toll,Charles | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.32 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 3 Required for Majors | 11 Graduate | 1 Major |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 2 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 9 General | 0 | 14 Non-major |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 2 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 Electives | 2 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 Other | 1 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 410 01 |
| Title: | Intro Complex Analysis |
| Instructor: | Chin,Sang H. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 10 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.20 | 1005/1589 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 482/1391 | 4.60 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 509/1552 | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 609/1495 | 4.33 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 768/1457 | 4.17 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.17 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 843/1572 | 4.25 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.25 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3.60 | 1569/1589 | 3.60 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 3.60 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3.67 | 1277/1569 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 3.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.30 | 1130/1530 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.30 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 586/1533 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.10 | 1112/1528 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.00 | 1174/1529 | 4.00 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 1057/1393 | 3.67 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 410 01 |
| Title: | Intro Complex Analysis |
| Instructor: | Chin,Sang H. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 10 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 411 01 |
| Title: | Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Potra, Florian A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.13 | 1078/1589 | 4.13 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.40 | 733/1391 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 436/1552 | 4.57 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 183/1495 | 4.75 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 326/1457 | 4.58 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.58 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.36 | 710/1572 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 373/1589 | 4.93 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 3.53 | 1352/1569 | 3.53 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 3.53 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 4.29 | 1145/1530 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 469/1533 | 4.93 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 1171/1528 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 1174/1529 | 4.00 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1393 | **** | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 411 01 |
| Title: | Linear Algebra |
| Instructor: | Potra, Florian A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 15 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 9 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 5 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 C 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 10 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 F 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 441 01 |
| Title: | Intro Numerical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Suri,Manil |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 29 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.53 | 620/1589 | 4.53 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 4.53 | 584/1589 | 4.53 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.53 | 576/1391 | 4.53 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 636/1552 | 4.43 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.43 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.57 | 1267/1495 | 3.57 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 3.57 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 308/1457 | 4.60 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 4.65 | 348/1572 | 4.65 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.65 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4.71 | 920/1589 | 4.71 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 4.19 | 779/1569 | 4.19 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.19 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 4.59 | 773/1530 | 4.59 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 352/1533 | 4.94 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 4.24 | 1009/1528 | 4.24 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.24 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 4.47 | 772/1529 | 4.47 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.47 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 441 01 |
| Title: | Intro Numerical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Suri,Manil |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 29 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4.00 | 796/1393 | 4.00 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 6 | Required for Majors 14 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 5 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 6 | General 0 | Under-grad 17 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 0 | | Non-major 9 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives 3 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 476 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Game Theory |
| Instructor: | Armstrong,Thoma |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 28 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 3.71 | 1424/1589 | 3.71 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 3.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3.41 | 1494/1589 | 3.41 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 3.41 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 4.06 | 1033/1391 | 4.06 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.06 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.46 | 1327/1495 | 3.46 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 3.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.64 | 1211/1457 | 3.64 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3.50 | 1407/1572 | 3.50 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 3.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 4.24 | 1367/1589 | 4.24 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.24 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 2.93 | 1522/1569 | 2.93 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 2.93 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 3.75 | 1430/1530 | 3.75 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 3.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.38 | 1367/1533 | 4.38 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.38 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3.06 | 1480/1528 | 3.06 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 3.06 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3.44 | 1422/1529 | 3.44 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 3.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.57 | 1104/1393 | 3.57 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 3.57 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 476 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 28 |
| Title: Intro To Game Theory | | Questionnaires: 18 |
| Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.32 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: MATH 479 01 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 10 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|-----------|-------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Math Problem Solving Sem | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 8 | | | | |
| Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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 | 4 | 1 | 3.86 | 1326/1589 | 3.86 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 3.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.63 | 1437/1589 | 3.63 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 3.63 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 509/1552 | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1495 | **** | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.33 | 593/1457 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 735/1572 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 545/1589 | 4.88 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | 1416/1569 | 3.40 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 3.40 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 887/1530 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 1261/1533 | 4.50 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 992/1528 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 1003/1529 | 4.25 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 349/1393 | 4.50 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 1145/1337 | 3.50 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 3.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 702/1333 | 4.50 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.32 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 479 01 |
| Title: | Math Problem Solving Sem |
| Instructor: | Armstrong,Thoma |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 10 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | **** | 4.46 | 4.56 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/65 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.49 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.12 | **** |

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 | 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 8 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: MATH 490 01 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 18 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|-----------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Special Topics In Math | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 11 | | | | |
| Instructor: Hoffman,Kathlee | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | 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 | 8 | 4.73 | 353/1589 | 4.75 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.18 | 1015/1589 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.18 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 666/1391 | 4.56 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | 826/1552 | 4.36 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.17 | 784/1495 | 4.21 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.17 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.09 | 829/1457 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.09 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.55 | 452/1572 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.55 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 467/1589 | 4.90 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.38 | 546/1569 | 4.38 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.38 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 577/1530 | 4.66 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 872/1533 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.20 | 1035/1528 | 4.41 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.20 | 1050/1529 | 4.41 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.50 | 1367/1393 | 3.39 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 2.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 823/1337 | 4.00 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 766/1331 | 4.17 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1190/1333 | 3.83 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 3.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 490 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 18 |
| Title: Special Topics In Math | | Questionnaires: 11 |
| Instructor: Hoffman,Kathlee | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.33 | 1002/1014 | 2.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 2.33 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 490 02 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Math |
| Instructor: | Peercy,Bradford |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 290/1589 | 4.75 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.78 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 704/1589 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 402/1391 | 4.56 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.44 | 604/1552 | 4.36 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 693/1495 | 4.21 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.25 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 465/1457 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.44 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.11 | 995/1572 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.11 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 519/1589 | 4.90 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 546/1569 | 4.38 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.38 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 711/1530 | 4.66 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 539/1528 | 4.41 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 586/1529 | 4.41 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.29 | 560/1393 | 3.39 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.29 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 823/1337 | 4.00 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 989/1331 | 4.17 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 1007/1333 | 3.83 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 490 02 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Math |
| Instructor: | Peercy,Bradford |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | 2.33 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.32 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 600 01 |
| Title: | Real Analysis |
| Instructor: | Gowda,Muddappa |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 20 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 4.78 | 290/1589 | 4.78 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.78 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.76 | 279/1589 | 4.76 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.88 | 175/1391 | 4.88 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 156/1552 | 4.83 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3.54 | 1290/1495 | 3.54 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.54 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 169/1457 | 4.75 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 4.78 | 210/1572 | 4.78 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.78 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 123/1569 | 4.87 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.87 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 4.89 | 195/1528 | 4.89 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 116/1529 | 4.94 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.94 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 435/1393 | 4.40 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1090/1337 | 3.60 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 3.60 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 1284/1331 | 3.00 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 3.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | 1259/1333 | 3.40 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 3.40 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: MATH 600 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 20 |
| Title: Real Analysis | | Questionnaires: 18 |
| Instructor: Gowda,Muddappa | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.13 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|----|---------------------|------|---|---|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 9 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 9 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 601 01 |
| Title: | Measure Theory |
| Instructor: | Rathinam,Muruha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 204/1589 | 4.86 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 340/1391 | 4.71 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 156/1552 | 4.83 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | 1215/1495 | 3.67 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 400/1457 | 4.50 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 901/1589 | 4.71 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1569 | 5.00 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 559/1530 | 4.71 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 1029/1533 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 458/1529 | 4.71 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.71 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 601 01 |
| Title: | Measure Theory |
| Instructor: | Rathinam,Muruha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1311/1393 | 3.00 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.00 |

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 6 | Major 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 1 | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 2 | Under-grad 1 | Non-major 0 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 2 | F 0 | Electives 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 614 01 |
| Title: | Partial Differentl Eq |
| Instructor: | Bell,Jonathan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 10 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.88 | 1313/1589 | 3.88 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.38 | 1503/1589 | 3.38 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3.88 | 1162/1391 | 3.88 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 3.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.50 | 1421/1552 | 3.50 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 3.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.29 | 1396/1495 | 3.29 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.29 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.67 | 1194/1457 | 3.67 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3.71 | 1307/1572 | 3.71 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 3.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 598/1589 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.86 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.25 | 1462/1569 | 3.25 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 3.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.13 | 1266/1530 | 4.13 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 1154/1533 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 1482/1528 | 3.00 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 3.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.25 | 1459/1529 | 3.25 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 3.25 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1393 | **** | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.91 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.29 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.51 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 614 01 |
| Title: | Partial Differentl Eq |
| Instructor: | Bell,Jonathan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 10 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.51 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 620 01 |
| Title: | Numerical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Draganescu,Andr |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 253/1589 | 4.80 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 228/1589 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 252/1391 | 4.80 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1552 | 5.00 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 183/1495 | 4.75 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1457 | 5.00 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 388/1572 | 4.60 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 509/1569 | 4.40 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.40 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 1181/1533 | 4.60 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.60 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 570/1528 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 5.00 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 435/1393 | 4.40 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.29 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.51 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 620 01 |
| Title: | Numerical Analysis |
| Instructor: | Draganescu,Andr |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.51 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 627 01 |
| Title: | Intr Parallel Comp |
| Instructor: | Gobbert,Matthia |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.50 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1552 | 5.00 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 309/1495 | 4.60 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1457 | 5.00 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 183/1569 | 4.75 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 321/1529 | 4.80 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 266/1393 | 4.60 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 267/1337 | 4.75 | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 623/1331 | 4.50 | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 137/1014 | 4.75 | 3.83 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.75 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 627 01 |
| Title: | Intr Parallel Comp |
| Instructor: | Gobbert,Matthia |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | 2.60 | 3.85 | 4.75 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 650 01 |
| Title: | Foundtns Of Optimization |
| Instructor: | Guler,Osman |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.50 | 646/1589 | 4.50 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 853/1589 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 799/1391 | 4.33 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.88 | 1210/1552 | 3.88 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 824/1495 | 4.13 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.13 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.88 | 1024/1457 | 3.88 | 4.21 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.88 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.11 | 995/1572 | 4.11 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.11 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 519/1589 | 4.89 | 4.77 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3.71 | 1241/1569 | 3.71 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 3.71 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | 1193/1530 | 4.22 | 4.42 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.22 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 924/1533 | 4.78 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3.67 | 1367/1528 | 3.67 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 3.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.89 | 1263/1529 | 3.89 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 3.89 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2.86 | 1341/1393 | 2.86 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 2.86 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1337 | **** | 3.71 | 4.17 | 4.29 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1331 | **** | 3.87 | 4.35 | 4.51 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | MATH 650 01 |
| Title: | Foundtns Of Optimization |
| Instructor: | Guler,Osman |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 3.94 | 4.40 | 4.51 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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