INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Title

Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1018 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1		3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	2	8		1427/1576		4.29	4.30	4.11	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	4	7	3.55	1380/1576	3.59	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	938/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	5	4	4		1396/1520	3.62	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	4	2	4		1214/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	4	2	5		1204/1434		4.27	4.14	3.94	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	4	8		1219/1547	3.79	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574		4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1240/1554	3.71	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1382/1488	3.92	4.47	4.47	4.41	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	582/1493	4.60	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	3	4	6		1330/1486		4.17		4.26	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	3	3	7		1305/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	963/1277	3.63	3.71	4.03		3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	4	4	5		1076/1279	3.47	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	5	4	5		1119/1270	3.59	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	3	5	3	5		1079/1269	3.63	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	4	0	0	1	1	0	3 50	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	237/ 240	2.83	3.61	4.35	4.29	2.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1 1	0	1 1	0 5	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	U	Τ	5	0	1	3.14	270/ 375	3.14	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.14
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	, -	3.22	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22
	-		-	-	-	-				- · · -			- · · -	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	1	0	7	0	0	2.75	379/ 382	3.19	3.44	4.08	3.86	2.75

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: SEI

SEIDMAN, THOMAS

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1018 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Questions

Instructor: SHARMA, NEERAJ

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1019 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland

		Genera																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	2	3	7	9	3	3.33	1494/1576	3.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.33
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	3	6	8	6	3.63	1360/1576	3.59	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	0	0	7	9	7	4.00	972/1342	4.05	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.00
		uations reflect			2	5	0	1		10	3	3.83	1212/1520	3.62	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.83
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	6	2		3		6	3.56	1221/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.56
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	8	0		1	6	4	3.92	978/1434	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.92
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2		1	2	6	6	8	3.78	1227/1547	3.79	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.78
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	927/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.65
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	12	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1159/1554	3.71	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.77
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture				0		1	3	6	11	4.29	1087/1488	3.92	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.29
		ctor seem inter				0		0	3				1337/1493					
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	1149/1486	3.73	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.95
		es contribute t			5		1						1091/1489					
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	13	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1277	3.63	3.71	4.03	3.91	****
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1279	3.47	3.63	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were a	.11 studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1270	3.59	3.84	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1269	3.63	3.97	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		19	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 878	4.40	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
F Wasse		Labora		early specified	1.0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4 00	220/ 270	4 00	4 10	4 20	4 15	4 00
5. were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts ci	early specified	12	U	U	U	U	13	U	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00
E Mara a	mitomio d	Semina for grading mad			19	0	0	0	_	0	1	2 22	****/ 375	2 1/	2 27	4 01	2 70	****
o. were c	illella 1	tor grading mad	e Clear		19	U	U	U	5	U	1	3.33	/ 3/5	3.14	3.41	4.01	3.70	
г ъ: а		Field		ield activities	16	0	0	0	0	^	1	2 22	219/ 326	2 00	2 20	4 02	2 (1	2 22
5. DIG CO.	nrerences	s neip you carr	y out I	ield activities	Τ0	U	U	U	8	U	Τ	3.22	219/ 320	3.22	3.38	4.03	3.04	3.22
F 17 +	1	Self		h	1 77	0	0	0	_	1	0	2 (2	206/ 202	2 10	2 44	4 00	2 06	2 62
5. were t	nere enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	ne students	17	U	0	U	5	Т	2	3.63	206/ 382	3.19	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.63
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	9	Graduate	:	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	В 5															
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 9		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-gr	ad 2	25	Non-	major	25	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49		D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - M					βh
				P 0									response	s to k	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					2						
				? 1														

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Instructor:

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 23

56-83

Grad.

84-150

1

0

1

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1020 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
			, 														
		General	-														
			ls from this course	0	0	0	3	5	7	8		1274/1576		4.29	4.30	4.11	3.87
			the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	891/1576			4.27	4.18	4.30
			the expected goals	0	0	1 1	1	3 1	5		4.22				4.32	4.19	4.22
			the expected goals ate to what you learned	0 1	10 10	1	1	2	4			880/1520 1043/1465			4.25 4.12	4.09 4.02	4.23
			bute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	2	3			1043/1403		4.27		3.94	
		system clearly	-	1	0	1	0	1				480/1547			4.19	4.10	4.55
		was class cance		1	0	0	0	0	13			1202/1574				4.59	
			l teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	6			794/1554				4.01	
		Lecture	2														
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	708/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.64
			ested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0			4.86		4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.86
			dand explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2			4.38			4.17		4.26	4.38
			what you learned	2	0	1	1	1			4.52	. ,		4.27		4.22	4.52
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance your understanding	2	18	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	***
		Discuss															
			11	0	2	1	2	3			1064/1279		3.63		3.96	3.50	
	ass discussions contribute to what you lear I students actively encouraged to particip e instructor encourage fair and open discus			11 11	0 0	2 1	1	0 1	4			1054/1270 1116/1269		3.84 3.97		4.09	3.75 3.50
		chniques succes	_	11	10	0	0	1	0			****/ 878		3.91		3.91	****
		Laborat	corv														
1. Did th	e lab inc		nding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	***
			e background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 240		3.61	4.35	4.29	****
		tructor provide		21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	***
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts clearly specified	11	2	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	208/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.10
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear	15	1	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.00
	_	Field W								_							
5. Did co	nierences	help you carry	out field activities	14	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	219/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22
F Mans t	hana an	Self F		1 2	0	0	0	1.0	0	0	2 00	212/ 200	2 40	2 44	4 00	2 06	2 00
o. were t	re there enough proctors for all the students		all the students	13	0	0	0	10	0	U	3.00	313/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0 A 8		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	4	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 7									1		0			0.0

General

Other

Electives

2

1

5

Under-grad 22

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major 23

С

D

F

Ρ

I

4

1

1

0

0

1

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: GOWARD, RUSSELL

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 1021 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1405/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	1	5		1445/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	5		1093/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	0	1	3		1041/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	0	5		1012/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	797/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	6	1	2	3	3.17	1432/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1434/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	2	1	2	2.73	1509/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	2	2	4	3.25	1428/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1454/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	4	1	5		1342/1486		4.17	4.32	4.26	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	3	5		1231/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	1	3	3	3.09	1174/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1030/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	1	2	5		1047/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	4.50	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	186/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.17
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	265/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.17
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	180/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	219/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.50
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	1						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

RILEY, SAMANTHA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1022 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eque	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	243/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.80
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.90
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	369/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.70
		ations reflect	_	_	0	4	0	0	2	0		4.33	768/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.33
	_	-		nat you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1			758/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.14
				what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1		4.25	,	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.25
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	303/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.70
	-	was class cance		ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3 4	7 6	4.70 4.60	866/1574 316/1554	4.61 4.14	4.78 3.99	4.64	4.59 4.01	4.70
9. HOW WOL	uia you g.	rade the overa.	II teach	ing effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	4	О	4.00	310/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.60
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488		4.47	4.47	4.41	
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.89
				plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.88			4.17	4.32	4.26	4.88
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89		4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.89
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance you	ur understanding	1	5	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.00
		Discus	sion															
			-	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.75	
		discussions contribute to what you learn students actively encouraged to participa					0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.50
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.75
		Laborat	tory															
5. Were re	equirement	ts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were ci	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	****
		Field V	Work															
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry		eld activities	6	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self I	Da = a = d															
5. Were th	here enoug	gh proctors for		e students	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	203/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.67
				_		- ·												
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Tyj	pe			Majors		
00-27	27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 3							 ed f	or Ma	iors	 3	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						J ~) -		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - I				_	h	
				P 0									response	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					4						
				3 0														

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA

Enrollment:

45 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1023 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	3			ructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	289/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	91/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	191/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	239/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	159/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	110/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	179/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	658/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1486	4.51	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	533/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	771/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	736/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	4.50	3.91	4.05	3.91	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	***
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad 1	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means t	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to b	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2009

Page 1024 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	6		1148/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	668/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	406/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	7	4.42		4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	1	8	4.08	808/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	3	6	4.67		4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	,	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.87	547/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	518/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	,		4.17	4.32	4.26	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	506/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03		4.29
Discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.63	265 /1270	4 01	2 (2	1 17	2 06	4.63
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1 1	1 1	6 6	4.63	365/1279	4.01 4.22	3.63 3.84	4.17	3.96 4.09	4.63
	7	0			1	_	-		- ,			4.35		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	, 8	3	0	0	T	1	6	4.63		4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	1	U	1	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.50	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	128/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work	1.4	0	_	0	0	1	0	4 00	**** / EO		2 00	4 40	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48		3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	213/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.25
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	193/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.80

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1024 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC

Title

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1025 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1		1383/1576		4.29	4.30	4.11	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1053/1493	4.67	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33			4.73	4.73	4.05	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	,		4.27	4.32	4.22	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.84	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.91	4.05	3.91	5.00
Laboratory														
	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2 67	021/024	2 67	2 67	4 00	4 00	2.67
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material			1	1	0	0	1	2.67	231/ 234		2.67	4.23	4.08	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	198/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	,	3.50	3.50	4.51	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232		5.00	4.29	4.27	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.10	4.20	4.15	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.52	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.50	4.69	4.52	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.83	4.61	4.55	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	3.27	4.01	3.78	5.00
ni alid wasta														
Field Work	-1	_	1	^	^	0	1	2 00	46/ 50	2 00	2 00	4 40	4 00	2 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	46/ 52	3.00	3.00	4.48	4.20	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	0	0	0	1		43/ 48	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.11	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 44		5.00	4.73	4.71	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45		5.00	4.57	4.72	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	3.38	4.03	3.64	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	38/ 40	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.44	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 24	4.50	4.50	4.83	4.71	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	32/ 35		4.00	4.67	4.68	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.78	4.65	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	2	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 382				3.86	5.00
									, - , -					

Title ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1025 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 115 0101 Title

FINITE MATHEMATICS

Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1026 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	7	6	3		1510/1576		4.29	4.30	4.11	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	5	2	6	3.10	1515/1576	3.10	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	5	6		1191/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	4	4	4	3	3.12	1461/1520	3.12	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	3	1	4	2	3.08	1372/1465	3.08	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	6	0	3	3.08	1364/1434	3.08	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	5	3	8	3.52	1338/1547	3.52	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	739/1574	4.76	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	2	8	3	0	2.80	1501/1554	2.80	3.99	4.10	4.01	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	2	7	6	3 68	1365/1488	3.68	4.47	4.47	4.41	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	6	9		1387/1493		4.73	4.73	4.65	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	3	5	4	-		1458/1486	2.71				2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	5	6	3		1332/1489			4.32		3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	3	1	4	0	0		1264/1277		3.71	4.03	3.91	
3. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	3	10	3		-1	U	U	2.13	1204/12//	2.13	3.71	4.03	3.91	2.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	2	5	1	4	3.07	1178/1279	3.07	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	915/1269	4.07	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	2	0	1		****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	2	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	3.50	4.55	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	1	0	0	10	1		341/ 379	3.83	4.10	4.20		3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	0	_	1	U	U	10	_	3.03	341/ 3/9	3.03	4.10	4.20	4.13	3.03
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 375	****	3.27	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3 67	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	, -	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	4	0	3		162/ 326		3.38	4.03	3.64	3.86
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	13		U	U	-	U	J	3.00	102/ 320	3.00	3.30	4.05	3.04	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	,	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	8	1	2	3.45	227/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.45

Title FINITE MATHEMATICS

Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1026 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	11	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	2						

Title MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II

Questions

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1027 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

	General																	
_	J ,			2	-	-	-	U	•	_			,					
					-		-	-	-	_								4.83
				3				-	_									4.6
		_	_				-	-	-	_			. ,					4.80
_	-	_			-	-	-		-	_			,					4.4.
	_		you re	earned			-	-	-	_								4.7
		-				-	-	-	-	_								4.9
-			ffoatir				-		-	_			, -					
ita you g	grade the overar	i teaching e	TIECCIN	/elless		U	U	U	U	3	0	4.73	215/1554	4.73	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.7.
	Lecture																	
																		4.5
			-															4.9
	_	_		arly				-	_									4.6
		-			-		-		_		-		,					4.6
liovisua.	l techniques enh	ance your un	derstar	nding	0	3	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	812/1277	3.89	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.8
					10	0	0	0	1	0	1		,	****			3.96	***
							-	-	-	-	_		,	****			4.09	***
			discus	ssion					-	_	_		,					***
ecial te	echniques succes	sful			10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	***
	Laborat	ory																
equiremen	nts for lab repo	rts clearly	specifi	Led	4	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.1
	Seminar																	
riteria 1	for grading made	clear			8	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	209/ 375	3.50	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.50
	Field W	ork																
ference	s help you carry	out field a	ctiviti	les	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00
	Self P	aced																
nere enou	igh proctors for	all the stu	dents		9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
rned	Cum. GPA	Exp	ected 0	rades				Rea	asons	5			Tvr	oe .			Maiors	5
		-				Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	U	Graduate	9	U	Majo	r	0
		-				~		,				1	TT3					1.0
						Ger	nera.	L				Τ	Under-gi	rad I	L2	Non-	major	12
												0		·	. 1			1-
rad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						E⊥€	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	gn
Ü			D (
Ü			P ())		O+1	ner					9	response	es to b	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
	e instruction de communication de commun	a gain new insights, skil instructor make clear exam questions reflect exam questions reflect er evaluations contributed to the control of the c	a gain new insights, skills from this instructor make clear the expected exam questions reflect the expected exam questions reflect the expected signed readings contribute to what yetten assignments contribute to what grading system clearly explained by times was class cancelled ald you grade the overall teaching extered instructor's lectures well prepare instructor seem interested in the exture material presented and explain exture material presented and explain extures contribute to what you led to instructor encourage fair and open extracted in the exture setting explains to the exture setting the state of the exture setting explains the explai	a gain new insights, skills from this course instructor make clear the expected goals exam questions reflect the expected goals er evaluations reflect the expected goals are evaluations reflect the expected goals er evaluations contribute to what you lear the assignments contribute to what you lear the assignments contribute to what you lear grading system clearly explained by times was class cancelled and you grade the overall teaching effective the instructor's lectures well prepared instructor seem interested in the subject there material presented and explained clear electures contribute to what you learned diovisual techniques enhance your understant. Discussion ass discussions contribute to what you learned instructor encourage fair and open discuss electal techniques successful Laboratory equirements for lab reports clearly specifications. Seminar riteria for grading made clear Field Work efferences help you carry out field activities. Self Paced elere enough proctors for all the students are enough proctors for all the students. Cum. GPA Expected Commended Cum. GPA E	a gain new insights, skills from this course instructor make clear the expected goals are exam questions reflect the expected goals are evaluations reflect the expected goals are evaluations reflect the expected goals are revaluations as contribute to what you learned and you grade the overall teaching effectiveness. Lecture The instructor seem interested in the subject there material presented and explained clearly are recoursed to what you learned allowisual techniques enhance your understanding. Discussion Discussion Ass discussions contribute to what you learned are instructor encourage fair and open discussion decial techniques successful Laboratory requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar reflect Work afterences help you carry out field activities Self Paced dere enough proctors for all the students Frequence Cum. GPA Expected Grades The grading made Cum. GPA Expected Grades 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 1	a gain new insights, skills from this course instructor make clear the expected goals 0 exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 digned readings contribute to what you learned 0 expeding system clearly explained 10 expeding system clearly explained 10 expression 10 expeding system clearly explained 10 expeding system clearly explained 10 explained 10 explained 10 explained 10 explained 10 explained 10 explained clearly 10 explained 10 explained clearly 10 explained 10	a gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 constructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 constructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 constructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 constructions reflect the expected goals 0 0 constructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 constructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 constructor reflective goal goal goal goal goal goal goal goal	Rigain new insights, skills from this course 0	Signin Regin Reg	Signation Sign	Second S	Seminary Signary Sig	Second S	gain new insights,skills from this course	gain new insights, skills from this course	gain new insights, skills from this course 0	gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 301/1576 4.75 4.29 4.30	gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 3 9 4.75 301/1576 4.75 4.29 4.30 4.11 instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.83 201/1576 4.83 4.31 4.27 4.32 exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.67 406/1342 4.67 4.28 4.32 4.19 ter evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.67 406/1342 4.67 4.28 4.32 4.19 ter evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 1 1 4 7 4.42 499/1465 4.42 3.96 4.12 4.02 titem assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 193/144 4.75 4.27 4.18 3.94 titem assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 193/144 4.75 4.27 4.18 4.02 titem assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.92 110/1347 4.92 4.88 4.19 4.10 yt dimes was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.92 110/1347 4.92 4.78 4.64 4.59 titem as class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.92 501/1493 4.92 4.78 4.64 4.59 titem as class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.92 501/1493 4.92 4.73 4.74 4.41 instructor's lectures well prepared 1 1 2 9 4.67 4.67 501/1493 4.92 4.73 4.74 4.41 instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.67 501/1493 4.92 4.73 4.73 4.65 titure material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.67 501/1493 4.92 4.73 4.73 4.65 titure material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 501/1493 4.92 4.73 4.73 4.26 ilovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 812/1277 3.89 3.71 4.03 3.91

PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Title Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment:

119 Questionnaires: 50

Page 1028 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	9	12	24	4.12	1073/1576	3.98	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	14	28	4.33	864/1576	4.11	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	5	8	30	4.32	788/1342	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	2	6	8	20	4.19	929/1520	3.94	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	5	4	5	5	10	3.38	1302/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	383/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	10	29	4.31	784/1547	4.22	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	11	35	4.69	881/1574	4.39	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	2	9	12	10	3.82	1117/1554	3.84	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	10	35	4.61	736/1488	4.51	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	43	4.82	784/1493	4.50	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	3	15	24	4.19	1003/1486	4.07	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	8	31	4.31	921/1489	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	19	4	2	11	4	5	3.15	1131/1277	3.36	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	3	8	9	17	3.71	981/1279	3.62	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	2	5	13	14		1127/1270	3.43	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	2	7	12	13		1107/1269	3.44	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	9	31	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	3	0	1	0	3	3	4 14	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	3	0	0	0	5	2		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	7	0	0	0	17	2	4.11	208/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.11
Qamina														
Seminar	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	++++/ 05	****	4 50	4 70	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46 47	1 0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	4.50 4.50	4.72 4.69	4.52 4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 80	***	4.83	4.61	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	12	0	5	3.59	205/ 375	3.49	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.59
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	***	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	****/ 326	3.41	3.38	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	8	0	5	3.77	195/ 382	3.59	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.77

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 119
Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1028 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	50	Non-major	49
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	29	-		_	
				?	0						

PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Title SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 212 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1029 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	23	38	27	3.84	1291/1576	3.98	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	8	16	35	33		1248/1576	4.11	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	17	25	46	4.08	944/1342	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	45	2	7	14	10	18	3.69	1290/1520	3.94	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	40	5	2	12	19	18	3.77	1095/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	64	2	3	11	5	11	3.63	1162/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	7	14	25	47	4.14	947/1547	4.22	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	82	11		1427/1574		4.78	4.64	4.59	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	3	2	15	43	17	3.86	1088/1554	3.84	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	10	21	57	4.40	995/1488	4.51	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	3	2	11	34	41		1379/1493	4.50	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	6	4	16	28	37	3.95	1158/1486	4.07	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	4	10	31	40		1080/1489	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	62	5	2	5	4	12	3.57	987/1277	3.36	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	8	10	16	11	26	3.52	1055/1279	3.62	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	10	11	17	13	20		1175/1270	3.43	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	10	4	25	14	17		1160/1269	3.44	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.34
4. Were special techniques successful	25	51	3	2	8	3	4	3.15	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	90	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	91	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	1	0	0	2	1	1		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	3	0	0	2	38	5	4.07	216/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	92	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.07	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	93	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	93	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	33	5	6	3.39	225/ 375	3.49	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.39
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	1	0	1	2	0		****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	93	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	93	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	93	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	1	1	0	28	2	8	3.41	191/ 326	3.41	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.41
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	1	1	0	1	0.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	32	3	7	3.40	235/ 382	3.59	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.40

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 212 Questionnaires: 96 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1029 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	43	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	В	33						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	15	C	20	General	1	Under-grad	95	Non-major	95
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	19	D	6						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	58	-			
				?	5						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 27

SLOWIKOWSKI, WI Spring 2009

Page 1030 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera:	 1															
1. Did you	u gain new	v insights,ski		n this course	0	0	1	2	3	11	10	4.00	1148/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.00
		or make clear			0	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	698/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	t the ex	spected goals	1	0	1	2	1	12	10	4.08	948/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.08
		ations reflect			2	10	1	0	2	6	6		1012/1520		4.18	4.25	4.09	4.07
				what you learned	1	7	2	1	4	6	6		1152/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.68
				what you learned		16	1	0	2	2	5	4.00		3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.00
		system clearly		ined	0	0	2	0	4	6	15	4.19	908/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.19
	-	vas class cance			1	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	927/1574		4.78	4.64	4.59	
9. How wor	uld you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	11	9	4.22	752/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.22
		Lecture																
		ctor's lecture	-	-	1	0	1	0	1	5	19	4.58	786/1488		4.47	4.47	4.41	
		or seem inter		_	1	0	1	0	0	8	17		1184/1493		4.73	4.73	4.65	4.54
		_		xplained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	16	4.44	763/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.44
		contribute to	-		1	2	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	696/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	5	18	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	6	0	5	1	5	4			1148/1279		3.63	4.17	3.96	3.24
				d to participate	7	0	5	3	5	1	6		1208/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.00
				d open discussion	7	0	5	3	4	1			1207/1269		3.97		4.09	3.10
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	sstul		.7	15	2	0	2	0	Τ	2.60	****/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
_		Labora	-															
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	16	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.09
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		14	0	0	0	12	0	1	3.15	268/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.15
		Field N	Work															
5. Did con	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	ield activities	20	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were th	here enoug	gh proctors for	r all th	ne students	17	0	0	0	8	1	1	3.30	257/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.30
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00.07																		
00-27 28-55	4 5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 9		кес	quir	ea I	or M	ajor	ಽ	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or,	0
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	В 9 С 5		Cer	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad ?	17	Non	-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Gel	лета.	_				_	onder-g.	rau 2	. /	INOII-	iia jul	41
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here :	are not	enoud	h
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	J	P 0		11.0	CCL	v CD					respons				_	**
				I O		Ot.1	her				1	.9	I CDPOIID		5191			
				? 1														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1031 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 13 10 21 0	0 0 0 1 0 0 0	1 0 0 1 0 2 0 0	3 1 3 4 2 2 3 0 3	13 9 8 1 10 1 7 3	12 19 18 9 7 3 19 25 5	4.00 4.26	964/1576 448/1576 572/1342 1041/1520 637/1465 1162/1434 469/1547 488/1574 881/1554	4.48 4.25 3.93 3.71 3.91 4.36 4.71	4.29 4.31 4.28 4.18 3.96 4.27 4.38 4.78 3.99	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10	4.11 4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94 4.10 4.59 4.01	4.62 4.52 4.00 4.26 3.63 4.55 4.89
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 24	0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 1 1	1 3 3 2 1	7 6 8 5 0	19 17 21	4.38 4.59	652/1488 1150/1493 851/1486 602/1489 ****/1277	4.71 4.39 4.49	4.47 4.73 4.17 4.27 3.71	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91	4.68 4.57 4.38 4.59 ***
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	5 5 6 6	0 0 0 19	3 2 2 3	1 1 2 0	4 4 5 0	7 11 5 0	9 6 9 1	3.75 3.74	962/1279 1054/1270 1043/1269 ****/ 878	3.38 3.37 3.58 3.10	3.63 3.84 3.97 3.91	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	3.96 4.09 4.09 3.91	3.75 3.75 3.74 ***
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	10	0	3.82	346/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.82
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	282/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.10
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	219/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	11	0	3	3.43	231/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.43
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 12 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 28-55 6 1.00-1.99 1 B 6		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 4 C 4 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 2	19	Non-	major	28
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0 P 1 I 0 ? 0			ectiv ner	ves				1	#### - 1 respons				_	h

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1032 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions					NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain new	insights, skil		this course	1	0	0	0	6	8	22	4.44	727/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.44
		or make clear			1	0	0	0	5	7	24	4.53	581/1576		4.31	4.27	4.18	4.53
		stions reflect			1	0	0	2	2	7	25	4.53		4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.53
		tions reflect			1	13	0	2	2	7	12	4.26	848/1520		4.18	4.25	4.09	4.26
				at you learned	1	13	1	3	7	8	4		1257/1465		3.96	4.12	4.02	3.48
	_	-		what you learned	1	23	1	0	2	2	8	4.23		3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.23
		system clearly			2	0	0	1	2	9	23	4.54		4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.54
		as class cance	_		2	0	0	0	0	2		4.94	, -		4.78		4.59	4.94
				ng effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	9		4.24					4.01	4.24
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	the instruct	tor's lectures	s well pr	epared	1	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	568/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.72
2. Did th	ne instructo	or seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	908/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.75
3. Was le	ecture mate	rial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	9	23	4.50	678/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did th	ne lectures	contribute to	what yo	u learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	25	4.58	602/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.58
5. Did au	udiovisual t	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	1	28	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	****/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	****
		Discuss																
				at you learned	3	0	3	5	8	9	9		1076/1279	3.38		4.17	3.96	3.47
		_	_	to participate	3	0	6	2	4				1111/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.62
				open discussion	5 5	0	2	2	8	8	12	3.81	1015/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.81
4. Were s	special tech	cial techniques successful					1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
		Laborat	cory															
				ound information		0	1	0	0	0			****/ 240			4.35		****
5. Were r	requirements	s for lab repo	orts clea	rly specified	23	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	229/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00
		Semina	2															
5. Were c	criteria fo	r grading made	e clear		28	0	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	****/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	****
		Field W	Vork															
5. Did co	onferences h			eld activities	30	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	****/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	****
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were t	there enough	h proctors for	all the	students	23	0	0	0	12	1	1	3.21	278/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.21
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	 11	0.00-0.99	 0	A 9		 Rec	nuir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 `s	0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 11		2000			110	- ,	_	-	52 44440	-	-			0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 9		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 3	37	Non-	-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									3				3	
Grad.					are not	enoue	ıh											
	-		-	P 0									respons				_	•
I 0 Other 29					3													
				? 1														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 62
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1033 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne		ls from this course	0	0	0	0	6	8	13	4.26	952/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.26
			the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	638/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.48
			the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	11	13	4.22	857/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.22
4. Did ot	ther evalua	ations reflect	the expected goals	0	11	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1128/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.94
5. Did as	ssigned rea	adings contribu	te to what you learned	0	5	1	3	6	5	7	3.64	1187/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.64
6. Did wr	ritten ass	ignments contri	bute to what you learned	l 1	13	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1039/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.85
		system clearly		0	0	0	4	0	6	17	4.33	755/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.33
	_	was class cance		0	0	0	0	0	24	3		1417/1574		4.78	4.64	4.59	4.11
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	623/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.33
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	526/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.74
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem intere	sted in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	1065/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.65
3. Was le	ecture mate	erial presented	and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	792/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.42
			what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	513/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.65
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques enh	ance your understanding	1	16	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	692/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.00
		Discuss	ion														
1. Did cl	lass discu		te to what you learned	0	0	12	1	5	4	5	2.59	1240/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	2.59
			ouraged to participate	0	0	8	2	6	3	8		1205/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.04
		-	air and open discussion	0	0	6	1	7		-		1131/1269		3.97			3.44
		chniques succes		0	17	1	2	3	2			780/ 878				3.91	
		Laborat	oru														
5. Were r	requiremen		rts clearly specified	13	0	1	0	0	13	0	3.79	349/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.79
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria f	or grading made		12	1	0	0	14	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.00
		Field W	ork														
5. Did co	onferences		out field activities	19	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self F	aced														
5. Were t	there enoug		all the students	17	0	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	281/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.20
			Freq	uency	, Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	;			Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	l
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0 A 6			 equir					0	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0 A 6		κe	-quir	eu I	OT M	ajur	D	U	Graduate	Ξ	U	Ma JC)T	U
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7 C 7		Ge	enera	1				1	Under-g	rad ?	:7	Non-	-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7 D 2		00	JICI G	-				-	onacı g.			14011		21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0		El	Lecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
			P 0									response	es to b	e sigr	nifican	nt	
			I 0		Ot	her				2	4						
			? 0														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: GASSMAN, AMANDA

Enrollment:

54 Questionnaires: 27 Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1034 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

					equer			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did vou gain new i	nsights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	7	15	4.19	1027/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.19
	make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	12	10		1119/1576		4.31	4.27	4.18	4.04
	cions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	9	8		1178/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	3.63
	ons reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	6	5	5	3	3.15	1456/1520		4.18	4.25	4.09	3.15
	ngs contribute to what you learned	0	10	3	2	6	3	3	3.06	1377/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.06
6. Did written assign	nments contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	2	1	2	4	3.36	1278/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.36
7. Was the grading sy	stem clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	8	15	4.33	755/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was	s class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	866/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.69
9. How would you grad	de the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	5	11	6	3.68	1214/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.68
	Lecture														
1. Were the instructo	or's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	810/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.56
	seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	24	4.78	868/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.78
3. Was lecture materi	al presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	1	12	10	3.93	1177/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.93
4. Did the lectures of	contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	0	8	15	4.15	1035/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.15
5. Did audiovisual te	echniques enhance your understanding	1	16	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1143/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.10
	Discussion														
1. Did class discussi	ons contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	8	7	3	3.17	1161/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.17
	actively encouraged to participate	3		3	3	7	4			1161/1270	3.37		4.35	4.09	3.38
	encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	3	5	8	5	3.38	1151/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.38
4. Were special techn		4	15	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	849/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	2.50
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increa	ase understanding of the material	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
	with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
	cerials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
	actor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
	for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	****
	Seminar														
5. Were criteria for		17	0	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	254/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.20
	Field Work														
5. Did conferences he	elp you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	****
	Self Paced														
5. Were there enough	proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	8	1	5	3.79	194/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.79
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	-				ason	a			т	00			Madona	
creares rarmed	Cum. GPA Expected Grades					ason 				Ту	 he			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	=			
				2	Λ						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: GASSMAN, AMANDA

Enrollment:

58 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1035 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1576		4.29	4.30	4.11	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	476/1576		4.31	4.27	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7		709/1342		4.28		4.19	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	683/1520			4.25	4.09	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	5		4.38	537/1465				4.02	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	3		4.67	270/1434					4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0			4.53	492/1547		4.38	4.19	4.10	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.80	665/1574				4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	331/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	499/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	526/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	560/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	780/1279	3.38	3.63	4 17	3.96	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	3	3			1111/1270			4.35		3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	6		4.23	830/1269			4.35		4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	2	3		3.60						
Laboratory			_	_								4 00		
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/ 234	****	2.67		4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	***	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	3.50		4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	U	2	Т	4.33	****/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	180/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24		4.50	4.83		****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	6	1	0		297/ 382					
3. Here there charge proceeds for all the students	O	U	3	3	5	_	U	J.14	201/ 302	5.45	J.11	1.00	5.00	2.11
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Condity Found Com CDA Founded Condon				D = -		_			m				Ma =	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	0						

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Title Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 29 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1036 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	9	14	4.14	1065/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	406/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6			761/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	3	3	4	7		1271/1520	3.93		4.25	4.19	3.72
				3										
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2		4	5			1242/1465	3.71		4.12	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	1	3	2	4		1157/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	7			1020/1547			4.19	4.10	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	488/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	5	10	9	4.08	881/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.08
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	0	0	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	505/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	25	4.79	829/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	5	20	4.45	763/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	9	16	4.31	910/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1077/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	2	4	8	3.38	1112/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	0	5	4	6	3.19	1188/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	2	6	6	3.33	1163/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	14	1	0	2	2	2		****/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
	_		_	-	_	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	0	7	1							4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	۷	U	U	U	/		4.13	200/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
			-	0	-	-	2		,	****				****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0		0	0		5.00			4.50	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	198/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.78
Field Work		_	_											
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	223/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.20
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	6	1	7	4.07	184/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	4.07

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1036 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	2	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	1						

CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Title

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1037 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	11	36	4.55	582/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	13	35	4.57	528/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	37	4.55	541/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	2	1	4	6	20	4.24	869/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	571/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	33	1	2	3	3	11	4.05	857/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	46	4.87	148/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	12	36	4.58	1018/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	3	20	18	4.26	712/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	52	4.96	99/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	45	4.81	784/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	14	36	4.63	514/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	13	38	4.64	526/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32		4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	36	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	600/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	4	13	14	10		1147/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	14	10	11	5	10		1238/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	2.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	8	15	10	10		1188/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	43	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
T abanahanna														
Laboratory	4 -	_	1	0	0	0	1	2 00	****/ O24	****	0 67	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	6	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0 4	1		0	0	4		****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47 47	2	1	0	0	0	3		****/ 229 ****/ 232	****	3.50	4.51 4.29	4.43 4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	4	0	0	0	14	4		165/ 379	4.17	5.00 4.10	4.29	4.27	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	31	4	U	U	U	14	4	4.22	105/ 3/9	4.1/	4.10	4.20	4.13	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	2	0	0	13	1	2		235/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.31
The state of the s														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	3	0	0	16	0	5	3.48	183/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.48
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	19	2	8	3.62	206/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.62

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 68
Questionnaires: 53

SONG, YOUN J

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 1037 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	49
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	40	-			
				?	0						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 53

TIGHE, BONNY Spring 2009

Page 1038 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

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

Frequencies

Instructor

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							L L	eque	TICTE	5		TIID	LIUCLUI	COULSE	: Debr	ONDC	пелет	Sect
	Questions General						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights, skill	s from t	his course	0	0	0	2	2	8	41	4.66	415/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.66
		tor make clear t			0	0	0	0	2	7	44	4.79		4.48	4.31		4.18	4.79
		estions reflect	_	-	0	0	1	0	3	7	42		393/1342				4.19	4.68
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect t	he expec	ted goals	0	15	0	2	3	10	23	4.42	648/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.42
		eadings contribut			0	18	6	4	6	8	11	3.40	1292/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.40
		signments contrib			0	30	1	1	6	4	11	4.00		4.16		4.14	3.94	4.00
		g system clearly		ed.	0	0	0	0	7				503/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	
	-	was class cancel			0	0	0	0	0	12	41		720/1574				4.59	
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall	teachin	g effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	8	33	4.72	215/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.72
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well pre	pared	0	0	0	1	2	8	42	4.72	589/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.72
		tor seem interes			1	0	0	0	1	4	47	4.88	607/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.88
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	and expl	ained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	13	34	4.52	666/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.52
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	3	47	4.85	263/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.85
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					37	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	569/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.21
1 Did al	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							5	9	11	11	3 50	1064/1279	3 86	3 63	4.17	3.96	3.50
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate							5	9	10			1107/1270		3.84		4.09	3.63
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	3 5	4		6			1113/1269		3.97		4.09	3.51
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Were special techniques successful					28	1	2	1	1	6		****/ 878				3.91	****
Г Мана		Laborato		.1	2.2	0	0	0	0	1 /	_	4 20	120 / 270	4 17	1 10	4 00	4 1 5	4 20
5. were r	requiremen	nts for lab repor	rts clear	Ty specified	33	U	0	0	U	14	ь	4.30	139/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.30
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		30	0	0	0	18	2	3	3.35	231/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.35
		Field Wo	rk															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out fiel	d activities	36	0	0	0	12	3	2	3.41	191/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.41
			_															
5 Were t	here enou	Self Pa agh proctors for		students	34	0	0	0	11	5	3	3 58	211/ 382	3 36	3 44	4 08	3 86	3 58
		-3 F								_	_		,					
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27												0	Croduct		·	Na		2
	00-27					Ke	quir	eu I	or M	a jor	B	U	Graduat	=	0	Majo	JΙ	2
	56-83 4 2.00-2.99 4 C 11					Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 5	3	Non-	-major	51
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 2					Ge.	пста	_				J	onder-g.	Lau 5	, ,	MOII-	ilia JUI	JI
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 14 F 2					г 1.	ecti [.]	vec.				0	#### - I	Weane +	here :	are not	enous	rh
Grau.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 14 F 2					11.1	CCLI	v Ca				U	response				_	111
I O						O+1	her				Δ	2	T Cabour	-D -C - L	,c 5191	ıcaı		
	? 3											-						
	. 5																	

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Questions

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 48

Questionnaires: 18

18

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 1039 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

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

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

1 Did you	ı dəin ne	Genera w insights,ski		his course	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4 72	335/1576	4 44	4 29	4 30	4 11	4 72
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0		16		166/1576		4.31		4.18	4.89
		estions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	4	14		275/1342				4.19	4.78
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exped	cted goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	249/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.75
	_	adings contrib		-		5	0	2	2				975/1465					
		_		what you learned		9	1	1	0				1033/1434					3.86
		system clearly		ed	1	0	0	0	1	_			228/1547					
	-	was class cance		ng effectiveness	0 1	0	0	0	0				813/1574 124/1554					
J. 110W WOU	iiu you g	rade the overa.	II CEACIIII	ig effectiveness		U	U	U	U	2	13	1.00	124/1334	1.20	3.99	1.10	1.01	1.00
		Lecture	e															
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	5.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	-					334/1493					
		erial presented	_	_	0		0						241/1486					
		s contribute to			0	0		-	2	-			350/1489					
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques enl	hance youi	r understanding	0	9	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	283/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.56
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contrib		at vou learned	1	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	860/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.94
		ts actively en			1		2		3				1011/1270		3.84			
				open discussion	1	0	1	0	2						3.97			
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful	-	2	10	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.33
F		Labora	-	1.61.1	1.4	0	0	0	•	_	-	4 05	**** / 250	4 15	4 10	4 00	4 15	de ale ale ale
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cleai	cly specified	14	0	0	0	0	3	Τ	4.25	****/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		14	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	****
			_															
5 n' 1	_	Field V			1.0	0	0	0		-	•	2 00	002/206	2 05	2 20	4 00	2 64	2 00
5. Dia con	irerences	help you carry	y out fie.	ld activities	13	0	0	0	4	1	U	3.20	223/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.20
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were th	nere enou	gh proctors for		students	8	0	0	0	8	1	1	3.30	257/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.30
				Frequ	lency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Тур	e e			Majors	.
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduate	:	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		_	_						1	, .	•			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Gei	nera:	T				1	Under-gr	ad 1	.8	Non-	major	15
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					-7						1	инии		la a se -			.la
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - M response				_	111
	I 0					O+1	her				1	5	response	:0 LU L	e sign	ıııcal	ıc	
	? 2					001						9						
	? 2																	

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: CHIN, S Enrollment: 65

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1040 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				MD	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	E	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	Sec Mea
		Quescion	.s 															
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	5	4	10		1050/1576		4.29	4.30	4.11	
		ctor make clear		_	0	0	0	2	6	5	7		1264/1576		4.31	4.27	4.18	3.8
		uestions reflec			0	0	3	4	5	3	5		1283/1342		4.28	4.32	4.19	3.1
		uations reflect		_	0	7	1	1	3	3	5		1251/1520		4.18	4.25	4.09	3.7
				what you learned	1	5	0	0	4	4	6		758/1465		3.96	4.12	4.02	4.1
				o what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	,		4.27		3.94	
	-	g system clearl		ined	0	0	1	2	1	6	10	4.10	971/1547		4.38	4.19	4.10	4.1
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6	14		866/1574		4.78	4.64	4.59	4.
. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1166/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.
		Lectur	е															
. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	1142/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.3
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	5	13		1089/1493		4.73	4.73	4.65	4.6
				explained clearly	1	0	2	3	2	6	6		1313/1486		4.17	4.32	4.26	3.
		es contribute t			1	0	3	1	4	4	7		1302/1489			4.32		3.
				our understanding	1	10	1	0	2	2	4		812/1277				3.91	
Dia aua	iiovisua.	i ceciliiques en	riance y	our understanding	1	10	1	U	2	4	-	3.09	012/12/1	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.71	٥.
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	335/1279		3.63	4.17	3.96	4.
				ed to participate	5	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	928/1270		3.84	4.35	4.09	4.
Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	915/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.
Were sp	ecial to	echniques succe	ssful		5	8	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	654/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.
		Labora	tory															
. Did the	lab in	crease understa	nding c	of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	***	2.67	4.23	4.08	**
			_	ground information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	**
				for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229		3.50	4.51	4.43	**:
	_	structor provid			19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232		5.00	4.29	4.27	**:
		_		early specified	17	0	0	0	0	3	0		****/ 379		4.10	4.20	4.15	**:
		Semina	70															
. Were cr	riteria :	for grading mad		•	13	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	270/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.1
		. , ,																
Did son	· -	Field			13	0	0	0	6	1	0	2 1 4	237/ 326	2 25	2 20	4 02	2 64	2
. Dia con	irerence:	s neip you carr	y out I	field activities	13	U	U	U	0	1	U	3.14	231/ 320	3.45	3.30	4.03	3.04	3
		Self																
. Were th	nere eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students	12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.0
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
redits Ea	irned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Τv	ре			Majors	3
				·														
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	(
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4				_				_			_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_						_						
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0					Electives								#### - Means there are not enough			jh		
				P 0					_			respons	es to k	e sigr	nifican	nt		
I 0				Other					1	4								

? 0

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 66
Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1041 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-0116	ncie	S		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	17	23	4.40	787/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	18	24	4.47	668/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	15	25	4.42	683/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	2	15	12	4.34	756/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	1	7		10	3.94	947/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	704/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	14		4.50	527/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	33			1324/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	2		17			702/1554		3.99		4.01	
y. Now would you grade one everall eddoning erreceiveness	_	_	ŭ	_	_			1.20	,02,1331	1.20	3.,,,	1.10	1.01	1.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	17	25	4.49	895/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	13	30		1101/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	16	23	4.31	911/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	12	27	4.45	754/1489	4.39	4.27		4.22	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	23	3	2	5	5			1104/1277				3.91	
5. 21d ddd15/12dd1 555m114d55 5manot 75d1 dhdc125ddhd1ng		23		_			-	3.20		3.71	3.71	1.05	3.71	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	12	8	13	3.76	962/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	4	6	12	9		1161/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	4	10	10			1047/1269	3.77	3.97		4.09	3.72
4. Were special techniques successful	9	23	1	2	2	4	4	3.62			3.91		3.91	
1. Note Special Collingues Successful		23	_	_	-	-	-	3.02	0037 070	3.71	3.71	1.05	3.71	3.02
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	2	0	0	0	10	1		****/ 379	4.17		4.20	4.15	****
o. Here requirements for tax reports ofearly specified	32	_	ŭ	Ū	Ū		_	1.05	, 3.3		1.10	1.20	1.15	
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	0	9	1	0		****/ 375	3.20		4.01	3.78	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	1	0	16	1	1	3.05	249/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03		3.05
o. Did conferences help jou outin out lies desivicies		_	-	Ū		_	_	3.03	210, 320	3.23	3.30	1.05	3.01	3.03
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	12	0	2		261/ 382			4.08	3.86	3.29
		_	-	-		-	_		, 302					

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 66
Questionnaires: 45

I, WI Spring 2009

Page 1041 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned	arned Cum. GPA			ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	 А	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	45	Non-major	45
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34	-			
				?	3						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: NEWTON, ROBERT

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1042 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 8 12 19	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 1 0 2	5 4 5 2 4 1 2	12 8 11 8 7 2		4.30 4.25 4.40 3.88 4.56	683/1520 1012/1465	4.48 4.30 4.32 3.93	4.31 4.28 4.18 3.96 4.27	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19	4.11 4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94 4.10	4.19 4.30 4.25 4.40 3.88 4.56 4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 5	0	0	0	0	2 10	26	4.93	375/1574 1117/1554	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.93
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 3 1 0	3 1 5 8 4	7 10 8 7 2	11	4.56 4.00 4.04	858/1488 1167/1493 1101/1486 1102/1489 987/1277	4.74 4.31 4.39		4.32	4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91	4.04
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	3 3 4 4	0 0 0 7	0 1 1 2	1 4 3 3	6 8 6 4	8 4 6 6	8	3.56 3.71	777/1279 1123/1270 1055/1269 784/ 878	3.77	3.84 3.97	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	3.96 4.09 4.09 3.91	
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24 12	0	2	0	0	1 13	1		****/ 240 229/ 379	**** 4.17		4.35 4.20	4.29 4.15	**** 4.00
Seminar 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26 16	1 1	0	0	0 11	1	0		****/ 80 287/ 375	**** 3.20		4.61 4.01	4.55 3.78	**** 3.00
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	219/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 6 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0	. — — —		quire		or M	ajor		0	Graduat		0	Majo Non-	or major	1 27
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ectiv ner	ves				2.9	#### - 1 respons				_	h

ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Title Instructor: KELLY, BRIAN W

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 29

Page 1043 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«» «10»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	9	16	4.38	818/1576	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	15	4.38	798/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	500/1342	4.47	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	6	4	14	4.33	768/1520	4.15	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	5	4	10	4.00	850/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	748/1434	4.09	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	20	4.52	515/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	375/1574	4.91	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	623/1554	3.91	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	442/1488	4.63	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	683/1493	4.78	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	20		499/1486	4.20	4.17		4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	8		4.59	590/1489	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	5	1	0	3	6	3.27	1104/1277	3.24	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	603/1279	4.12	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	9		4.38	756/1270	3.96	3.84	4.17	4.09	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	773/1269	3.78	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	0	1	1	2		4.22	383/ 878		3.91			4.22
4. Were special techniques successiui	5	13	U	_		4	5	4.22	303/ 0/0	3.01	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	198/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	7	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	7	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.09
Seminar			_	_			_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	4	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	3	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	207/ 375	3.37	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.56
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	3	1	3 50	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	1.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	4	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	242/ 326		3.38	4.03	3.64	3.13
5. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	Ι/	4	U	U	,		U	3.13	242/ 320	3.30	3.30	4.03	3.04	3.13
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	2	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	208/ 382	3.70	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.60

Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Instructor: KELLY, BRIAN W

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1043 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	-			
				?	0						

ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Title BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Instructor:

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1044 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	quer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1124/1576	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.05
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	759/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.41
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5		4.50	583/1342	4.47	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.50
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	6			1041/1520	4.15		4.25	4.09	4.00
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	5	6		3.93		3.91		4.12	4.02	3.93
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	5	3		3.92	991/1434	4.09	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.92
	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	2		4.43		4.50		4.19	4.10	4.43
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	,		4.78	4.64	4.59	4.95
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1303/1554	3.91	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.50
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	846/1488	4.63	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.53
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	1065/1493	4.78	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.65
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1085/1486	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.05
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1091/1489	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.05
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	2	1	1	1	1		1219/1277	3.24	3.71	4.03		2.67
										,					
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1000/1279	4.12	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.67
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	7	1	3		1185/1270	3.96	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.21
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	4	3	2		1197/1269	3.78	3.97		4.09	3.15
	Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	799/ 878	3.70	3.91		3.91	
4.	were special techniques successful	0	,	U	3	2	1	1	3.00	199/ 0/0	3.01	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.00
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****
				0	0	1	-	_		, -					****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0				0	1	4.00	****/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 229		3.50	4.51	4.43	
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	8	1	3.90	325/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.90
_	Seminar				•	_	_						4 = 0	4 = 0	
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00		****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	245/ 375	3.37	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.25
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	176/ 326	3.36	3.38		3.64	3.60
- •			-	-	-		-	-		-, -=-					
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	6	0			192/ 382			4.78	3.86	3.91
٥.	were there enough proctors for all the students	тт	U	U	U	U	U	5	3.91	194/ 304	3.70	3.44	1.00	3.00	3.91

Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1044 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-		_	
				?	0						

ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Title BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Instructor: Enrollment:

59 Questionnaires: 27 Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1045 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Questions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
×400 010110														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	6	13	4.00	1148/1576	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	15	4.15	1040/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	17	4.33	770/1342	4.47	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	2	7	11	4.13	969/1520	4.15	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	2	3	3	9	3.79	1081/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	777/1434	4.09	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	469/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	567/1574	4.91	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	2	11	5	3.90	1060/1554	3.91	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	798/1488	4.63	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	759/1493	4.78	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	7	3	11	3.91	1187/1486	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	3	13	4.17	1012/1489	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	876/1277	3.24	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	589/1279	4.12	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	814/1270	3.96	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	1	2	0	8		1007/1269	3.78	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 878	3.61	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
- 1														
Laboratory				•	•	_						4 00	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	145/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 85	****	4 E0	1 72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25 25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	4.50 4.50	4.72 4.69	4.52	****
		1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****				****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	-	0	-	-	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25 17	0	0	0	0 8	0 1	1	5.00			4.83	4.61	4.55	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Ι/	U	U	U	8	1	Τ	3.30	237/ 375	3.37	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.30
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	***	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	5	0	1		****/ 326	3.36	3.38	4.03	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	20	Τ	U	U	5	U	1	3.33	/ 326	3.30	3.30	4.03	3.04	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	208/ 382		3.44	4.08	3.86	3.60
J. HOLD CHOIC CHOUGH PLOCEOID FOR ALL CHE DECACHED	10	_	5	5	,	5	J	5.00	200/ 302	3.70	J. 11	1.00	5.00	3.00

Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1045 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	3	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 215 0101 Title

FINITE MATH FOR INFO S

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1046 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	2	1	3	12	11	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.00
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	1	0	0	9	19	4.55	542/1576	4.55	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.55
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	333/1342	4.72	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.72
		ations reflect			0	13	0	0	1			4.63	376/1520		4.18	4.25	4.26	4.63
				hat you learned	0	13	0	1	1		10	4.44			3.96	4.12	4.09	4.44
				what you learned	0	17	0	0	1			4.58	,	4.58	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.58
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	1	4			4.38	718/1547			4.19	4.22	4.38
	-	was class cance		ee	0	0	0	0	1 6	5 8	23 8	4.76	758/1574		4.78		4.62	4.76
9. How wo	ula you g	grade the overal	.1 teacn	ing effectiveness	6	1	U	U	6	8	8	4.09	876/1554	4.09	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.09
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	0	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	774/1488	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.59
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	1	4	3	21	4.52	1201/1493	4.52	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.52
				plained clearly	0	0	0	1	3							4.32		4.48
		ou learned	0	0	1	0	1			4.52			4.27		4.31	4.52		
5. Did au	diovisual	ur understanding	0	22	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/1277	****	3.71	4.03	4.01	****		
		Discuss																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	hat you learned	20	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	952/1279	3.78	3.63	4.17	4.14	3.78	
2. Were a	ll studen	its actively end	couraged	to participate	20	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1243/1270	2.67	3.84	4.35	4.30	2.67
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage f	air and	open discussion	20	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1184/1269	3.22	3.97	4.35	4.29	3.22
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		20	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab repo		arly specified	18	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.09
E Worke di	ritorio f	Seminar or grading made			19	0	0	0	9	1	0	2 10	282/ 375	2 10	2 27	4 01	1 21	2 10
o. Were C.	iiteiia i	or grading made	Clear		13	U	U	U	J	1	U	3.10	202/ 3/3	3.10	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.10
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out fi	eld activities	15	0	0	0	13	0	1	3.14	237/ 326	3.14	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.14
		Self F	Daced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for		e students	20	0	0	0	6	0	3	3.67	203/ 382	3.67	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.67
				D		- D-1	1											
				Frequ	ency	DIS	tribu	1110	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Typ	e			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	 quire		 or M	aior		1	Graduate	. – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 11		1,6,	7411	-u L	O1 14	۱۰۰ س	_	_	Graduate	-	J	1.10.10	<i>,</i> _	U
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C 3		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-gr	ad 2	9	Non-	-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D 0									9-				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
			I 0		Otl	her				2	4							
				? 1														

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1047 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Student (Course	Evalua	tion	Ouest:	ionnai:	re
--	-----------	--------	--------	------	--------	---------	----

							Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
1 544		General			0	0	0	0	0	_	1 -	4 75	201/1576	1 26	4 00	4 20	4 25	4 75
_	_	w insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5 1	15 19	4.75 4.95	301/1576 91/1576		4.29 4.31	4.30	4.35 4.32	4.75 4.95
		estions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	19		107/1342		4.28	4.32	4.32	
	_	ations reflect		_	0	7	1	0	0	2		4.54		3.90	4.18	4.25		4.54
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	7		4.59			3.96	4.12	4.09	4.59
				o what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	3	7	4.70			4.27	4.14		4.70
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	0		18		123/1547		4.38	4.19	4.22	
		was class cance		illied	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574		4.78		4.62	
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	11		4.35	- , -				4.02	
9. HOW WO	ouia you g	rade the overal	LI LEAC	ming effectiveness	U	U	U	U	1	11	0	4.33	597/1554	3.07	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.33
		Lecture																
	he instru		0	0	0	0	0	1			/	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.95		
2. Did th	e instruc	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	810/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.80		
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	422/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.70	
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute to	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	309/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.80	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	our understanding	0	16	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	****	
		Discuss	ni on															
1 Did al	acc diccu		what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	1	3 67	****/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
			d to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1270		3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
			d open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0			****/1269					****	
J. Dia cii	ic insciuc	cor encourage i	d open discussion	10	O	Ü	U	_	O	_	1.00	/1209	3.03	3.57	1.55	1.20		
_		Laborat																
5. Were r	requiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00
		Semina	<u>-</u>															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear	•	13	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00
		Field W	Jorde															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.00
		Self I									•		212/222			4 00		
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Res	asons	g			Туј	ne			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 11		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 7				_				_			_			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	T				1	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3 7	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				2	#### - 1				_	ıh	
			P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
				I O		Otł	ner				1	.5						

? 1

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1048 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	_															
		insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	10		4.50		4.26			4.35	4.50
		or make clear	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	,	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.57
		stions reflect			0	0	0	0	0			4.50	583/1342	4.27	4.28		4.41	
		tions reflect			1	8	1	0	1	8	9	4.26	848/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.26
	_	-		hat you learned	0	1	0	2	4	7		4.22		4.05	3.96		4.09	4.22
				what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	345/1434	4.19	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.57
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	1	2	7		4.50			4.38	4.19		4.50
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.93	, -	4.88			4.62	
9. How wo	uld you gr	ade the overa	II teach	ing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	584/1554	3.67	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.36
		Lecture																
		tor's lecture			0	0	0	0	2	3		4.75	505/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47		
		or seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.89	582/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.89
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	2			4.52					4.29	
		contribute to			0	0	0	2	1	9		4.39	823/1489	3.98	4.27		4.31	
5. Did au	diovisual	ur understanding	0	19	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	812/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.89		
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass discus		hat you learned	20	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1186/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	3.00	
			to participate	20	0	0	0	4	2			1054/1270		3.84		4.30	3.75	
				open discussion	20	0	0	1	3	2			1079/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	3.63
		hniques succes		-	20	5	1	0	1	0			****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	***
		Labora	torr															
5. Were r	equirement			arly specified	21	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00
	1			1 11														
F		Semina			1.0	0	0	•	0	•	-	2 00	054/ 255	2 05	2 05	4 01	4 01	2 00
5. Were c	riteria id	r grading made	e clear		18	0	0	0	9	0	Т	3.20	254/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.20
		Field W	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	22	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	****
		Self	Dagod															
5. Were t	here enoug	h proctors for		e students	17	0	0	0	8	0	3	3.55	214/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.55
		_																
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	son	s			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 A 8			nuire	ed fo	r M	aior	 s	0	Graduate	. – – – – –	0	Majo	 r	 5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 11		2000	_~		_ 11		~	-	22 344410	-	-		-	3
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Ger	neral					0	Under-gr	ad 2	18	Non-	major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001						-	220- 9-		-		, 0 =	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 1		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enoua	h
	-		-	P 0								-	response				_	
				I O		Oth	ner				2	3			5			
				? 1														

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1049 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	14	7	3.83	1308/1576	4.26	4.29	4.30	4.35	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	14	8	3.93	1207/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.32	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	9	11	3.97	1010/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	1179/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	5	8	10	4.04	829/1465	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	2	1	12	3	3.89	1015/1434	4.19	4.27	4.14	4.06	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	673/1547	4.54	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	188/1574	4.88	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	3	3	7	8	0	2.95	1466/1554	3.67	3.99	4.10	4.05	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	8	12	5	3.81	1343/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	986/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	5	12	4	3.48	1336/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	9	6	6	3.41	1345/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	****/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1270	3.72	3.84	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	***	3.61	4.35	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	***	3.00	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	276/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.22
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	_			
				?	1						

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1050 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA		_	uenci 2 3	es 4	5		tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General								_						4 00	4 0=	4 00
		insights, skil			0	0			0 3 1 3	6 5			1106/1576				4.35	4.08
		or make clear stions reflect			0	-			0 4	4	_		1217/1576 948/1342		4.31	4.27	4.32	3.92 4.08
	_	tions reflect	_	-	0				1 2	2			1449/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.41	3.20
				at you learned					2 2	4			1123/1465		3.96	4.12	4.09	3.73
				what you learned					0 2	3	_		1045/1434		4.27		4.06	
		system clearly		-	0		-		0 0	5			,		4.38	4.19	4.22	
		as class cance		cu	0				0 0	3			739/1574		4.78		4.62	
	-			ng effectivene		-			1 7	3			1410/1554		3.99	4.10		3.18
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	e instruct	tor's lectures	s well pr	epared	0	0	0 ()	0 2	6	5	4.23	1126/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.23
2. Did the	instructo	or seem intere	ested in	the subject	0	0	0 ()	0 1	3	9	4.62	1113/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.62
3. Was led	ture mate	rial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	. 0	0	0 ()	1 7	2	3	3.54	1323/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.54
4. Did the	lectures	u learned	0	0	0 () :	2 7	3	1	3.23	1385/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	3.23		
5. Did aud	iovisual	r understandin	.g 0	5	5 1	-	1 4	2	0	2.88	1196/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	2.88		
		Discuss																
			at you learned		0			1 0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
		-	to participate		0			1 0	1	-		****/1270		3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the	instruct	open discussio	n 11	0) 1	-	0 0	0	1	3.00	****/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	****		
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were re	quirement	s for lab repo	orts clea	rly specified	9	0	0)	0 0	4	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00
		Seminar	<u>-</u>															
5. Were cr	iteria fo	r grading made	e clear		8	1	L 0)	0 4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00
		Field W																
5. Did con	ferences l	nelp you carry	out fie	ld activities	7	1	L 0)	0 2	0	3	4.20	155/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	4.20
		Self I																
				at you learned			_		0 0	0	-	1.00	,	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****
		ons make clear	_	_	12				0 0	0	_		,		4.50	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were th	ere enougi	n proctors for	all the	students	11	1	L 0)	0 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	****
				Fr	equenc	y Di	istri	but	ion									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	es			1	Reaso	ns			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		 R	 Requi	red	for	 Мајо	rs	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			_			-						_		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		G	Gener	al				2	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E	Elect	ive	5			0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0		_							respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
			I 0		С	other					10							
				3 0														

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1051 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

OTTHICH .	31					
estionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_			Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1042/1576	4.26	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	9		1023/1576			4.27	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	5		1097/1342		4.28	4.32	4.41	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	5	4			1325/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	8			1166/1465	4.05		4.12	4.09	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	6		3.93	966/1434	4.19		4.14	4.06	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2		4.28	816/1547		4.38	4.19	4.22	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.78	720/1574	4.88	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	7	6			1303/1554				4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۷	U	1	U	,	0	2	3.50	1303/1334	3.07	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.50
Lecture														
	1	0	0	0	_	0	4	2 04	1000/1400	1 21	4 47	4 47	1 11	2 04
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	•	-	5	8	4		1282/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1			1006/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	5			1229/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4			1091/1489	3.98	4.27		4.31	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	6	3	1		1163/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1079/1270	3.72	3.84	4.35	4.30	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	5	2		1067/1269	3.65	3.97		4.29	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	4.50	4.72	4.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00
J J														
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	4	1	_		165/ 326	3.64	3.38		4.43	3.71
o. Did conferences help jou edill ede lield desivioles		Ü	Ū	ŭ	-	_	_	3.71	100, 020	3.01	3.30	1.00	1.15	3.71
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	3	0	0		****/ 382		3.44	4.08	4.39	****
J. Were energy proceds for all the students	11	Δ.	U	U	J	U	U	3.00	/ 302	J.40	J. 11	1.00	1.33	

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor:

MUSCEDERE, MICH

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1051 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	0						

Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 57
Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1052 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	u gain new	General w insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	5	4	13	13	3 97	1175/1576	4.33	4.29	4.30	4.35	3.97
		or make clear the e		0	0	0	3	9	8	15		1138/1576		4.31	4.27	4.32	4.00
		estions reflect the		1	0	0	0	4	11	19	4.44			4.28	4.32	4.41	4.44
	_	ations reflect the e	_	0	23	0	0	1	5	6	4.42			4.18	4.25	4.26	4.42
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contribute to	what you learned	0	10	2	1	2	9	11	4.04	829/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.04
		ignments contribute		0	13	1	0	3	8	10	4.18	758/1434	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.18
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	1	5	6	23	4.46	608/1547	4.46	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.46
	-	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	7	0	4	3	11	7	3	3.07	1436/1554	3.66	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.07
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	6	4	7	11	7	3.26	1428/1488	4.10	4.47	4.47	4.44	3.26
		tor seem interested		1	0	0	0	5	8			1232/1493		4.73	4.73	4.75	4.47
		erial presented and		0	0	5	10	9	6			1445/1486		4.17	4.32	4.29	2.89
		s contribute to what		0	1	9	6	5	7	7	2.91	1437/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.31	2.91
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	30	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1277	3.40	3.71	4.03	4.01	****
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contribute to	what you learned	30	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****
		s actively encourag	-	30	0	0	2	0	1	2		****/1270		3.84	4.35	4.30	****
		or encourage fair a		30	0	0	1	1	0	3		****/1269		3.97		4.29	****
		Laboratory															
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab reports c	learly specified	31	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.18	4.10	4.20	4.29	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made clea	r	20	0	0	0	13	0	2	3.27	243/ 375	3.13	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.27
5 Did ao	nferences	Field Work help you carry out	field activities	28	0	0	0	6	1	Λ	3 14	****/ 326	3 49	3 38	4 03	4 43	****
J. Dia co	mierences	neip you carry out	rielu accivicies	20	U	U	U	O		U	3.11	/ 320	3.40	3.30	1.03	1.13	
_		Self Paced						_									
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for all	the students	25	0	0	0	6	0	4	3.80	193/ 382	3.53	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.80
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	ре			Majors	;
		0.00.000															
00-27 28-55	0 3	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 1	A 21 B 9		ке	quir	ea I	or M	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo)r.	4
28-55 56-83	3 15	2.00-2.99 2	в 9 С 4		Cer	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 3	35	Non-	-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		GEI	иста	_				_	onder -g	rau 3	, ,	11011-	ilia jui	J.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
	-		P 0									respons				_	•
			I O		Otl	her				3	1			5-			
			? 0														

Course-Section: MATH 225 0201 Title

INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1053 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

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

			Question	5		NR	NA		_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			 Genera	 1															
1 т	nid voi	ı dəin n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	757/1576	4.33	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.43
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	- ,		4.31	4.27	4.32	
			uestions reflec		1 0	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21			4.28	4.32	4.41	
			uations reflect			0	7	0	1	0	1	5		648/1520			4.25		
					what you learned	0	3	0	2	3	4			1228/1465			4.12	4.09	3.55
6. I	Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	398/1434	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.50
7. V	Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	y expl	ained	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	805/1547	4.46	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.29
8. H	How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.71
9. I	How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1247/1554	3.66	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.64
			Lectur	9															
1. V	Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	970/1488	4.10	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.43
			ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.93
					explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8			1218/1486		4.17	4.32		3.85
			es contribute t		1	0	0	0	0	3	4			934/1489		4.27		4.31	
5. I	Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	nance	your understanding	0	3	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1143/1277	3.40	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.09
			Labora	cory															
5. V	Were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	4.18	4.10	4.20	4.29	****
			Semina	r															
5. V	Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clea	r	11	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.13	3.27	4.01	4.21	****
			Field																
5. I	Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out	field activities	10	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	180/ 326	3.48	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.50
			Self	Paced															
5. V	Were th	here eno	ugh proctors fo	r all	the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.53	3.44	4.08	4.39	****
					Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Cros	dits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.O.	asons				Ty	no			Majors	
	лтгр <u>Г</u> е		Cuiii. GPA							asons 	, 			ту.	 he			majors 	·
	-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
	-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3													_	
	-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 6		Ger	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	L 4	Non-	major	11
	-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								•						
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	ſh

Other

12

Ρ

I 0

1

1

INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Title Instructor: PEERCY, BRAD

Enrollment: 57 Questionnaires: 36 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1054 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	es		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	24	4.58	527/1576	4.33	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	22	4.50	608/1576	4.24	4.29	4.27	4.32	4.50
1 9					3									
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2			19	4.33	770/1342		4.28	4.32	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	731/1520	4.40	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	5	9	11	4.15	748/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	647/1434		4.27	4.14	4.06	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	26	4.64	375/1547	4.46	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	5	30	4.78	720/1574		4.78	4.64	4.62	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	14	14	4.27	692/1554	3.66	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	9	24	4.60	750/1488	4.10	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	683/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	11	17	4.32	901/1486	3.69	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	8	20	4.21	990/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	923/1277	3.40	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	0	1	1	3	3 43	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	1	1	3		****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	1	1	4		****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.29	****
4. Were special techniques successful	30	5	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****
4. Were special techniques successiui	30	5	U	U	U		U	4.00	7 676		3.91	4.05	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	182/ 379	4.18	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.18
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	15	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.13	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****
	35	0	0	1	0		0		,	****				****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations					-	0	-		****/ 45		5.00	4.57	4.64	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	8	4	1	3.46	185/ 326	3.48	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.46
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	14	0	2	3.25	269/ 382	3.53	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.25

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

Frequency Distribution

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 29 ? 1

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1055 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	1	0	0	2	6	7	29	4.43	742/1576	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.43
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	13	27	4.49	638/1576	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.49
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	16	27	4.56			4.28	4.32	4.41	4.56
		ations reflect			0	16	0	1	4	6	18	4.41		3.79	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.41
				hat you learned	0	13	1	4	4	10	13		947/1465		3.96	4.12	4.09	3.94
	_	_		what you learned	1	14	0	1	6	7	16	4.27			4.27	4.14	4.06	4.27
		signments contr. s system clearly			0	14	0	U T	-	12	30	4.27			4.27	4.14	4.06	
				nea	0	0	0	0	0	5	40	4.89	, -					
		was class cance				0	-	0	-				508/1574		4.78			
. How woul	la you g	grade the overa	II teach	ing effectiveness	7	U	0	U	3	17	18	4.39	545/1554	3.54	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.39
		Lecture	e															
. Were the	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	0	10	33	4.77	484/1488	3.96	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.77
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	37	4.84	734/1493	4.47	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.84
				plained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	13	23	4.44		3.55	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.44
		s contribute to			3	0	0	1	4	7	30	4.57	-,	3.60	4.27	4.32	4.31	
				ur understanding	3		3	1	2	5	6	3.59					4.01	
. Dia audi	IOVIDUUI	ccciniiques em	nance ye	ar anacrocanaring	3	23	3	_	_	3	Ü	3.35	303,12,,	3.33	3.71	1.05	1.01	3.33
		Discus																
				hat you learned	39	0	2	0	1	2	1		****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	***
2. Were all	l studen	its actively en	couraged	to participate	39	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****
B. Did the	instruc	tor encourage :	fair and	open discussion	39	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.29	****
. Were spe	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		39	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****
		Labora	torv															
. Were red	quiremen	its for lab rep	_	arly specified	32	0	1	0	0	12	0	3.77	350/ 379	3.99	4.10	4.20	4.29	3.77
		Semina	r															
. Were cri	iteria f	or grading made	e clear		23	0	0	0	21	0	1	3.09	282/ 375	3.32	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.09
		Field																
Did conf	ferences	help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	26	0	0	0	19	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.07	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.00
		Self						•		•			000/000			4 00	4 00	
. Were the	ere enou	igh proctors fo	r all th	e students	27	0	0	0	14	0	4	3.44	228/ 382	3.32	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.44
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	 3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11			 quire		 or M	 aior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		8
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 20		re(4utt (a L	OT M	ajur	۵	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC) <u> </u>	O
28-55 56-83	10	2.00-2.99	4	C 13		Cc-	nera:	1				0	IIndon	rad 1	:5	N™o∽	mo dos	37
	2		4 6	D 0		Gel	nera.	L				U	Under-g	ıau 4	د:	MOII-	-major	3 /
84-150		3.00-3.49		- *								2	шшліп -	Maar - '	bar -			.lo
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F 0		ΕIE	ectiv	/es				2	#### - 1				_	11
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	niican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				4	:2						
				? 0														

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 44

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1056 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	1019/1576	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.20
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	5			1100/1576			4.27		
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	6			770/1342		4.28		4.41	
		ations reflect			0	6	0	2					1179/1520		4.18		4.26	
				what you learned	0	7		1					647/1465		3.96		4.09	
				o what you learned	0	9	-	0	1				594/1434				4.06	
		system clearly			0	0	0	1	0	_			339/1547				4.22	
		was class cance		illica	0	0	0	0	0				328/1574					
				hing effectiveness	2	1	1	2	7	0			1448/1554					
				5														
		Lectur		ī	0	0	0	-	0	_	-	4 00	1155 /1400	2 06	4 45	4 45	4 44	4 00
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	1	2	5			1155/1488		4.47		4.44	4.20
		ctor seem inter			0	0		0	2	5			1286/1493		4.73		4.75	
				explained clearly		0							1437/1486		4.17		4.29	
		es contribute to			0	1							1445/1489				4.31	
Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	11	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1277	3.59	3.71	4.03	4.01	***
		Discus	sion															
l. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****
				ed to participate	14		0	0	1	0			****/1270			4.35		***
		Tabassa	.															
5. Were r	equiremen	Labora nts for lab repo		early specified	9	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	3.99	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00
	1												,					
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	209/ 375	3.32	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.50
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	3.07	3.38	4.03	4.43	***
		Self	Dagod															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors fo		he students	9	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.32	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.17
				P		- D-1	2 1		_									
				Frequ	ency	DIST	Lribi	10131	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	;
 00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	 mir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		1.0				. , 0 1	-	-	or adda.	-	-			_
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 1		061	icia.	-				J	onder g.	Luu I	_	14011		10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		দ14	ectiv	769				1	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Siaa.	J	3.30 1.00	1	P 0		11.1	LT	v CD				_	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	ner				1	.3	T CDPOILD	D	- Digi	roar		
				1 0		OLI	.101				1							

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: GOWARD, RUSSELL

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1057 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did		Genera insights,ski		+b:	0	0	1	0	6	10	8	2 06	1185/1576	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.35	3.96
		or make clear			0	0	1	1	8	9	8		1322/1576		4.29	4.30	4.35	3.96
		stions reflect			0	0	1	1	5	10	8		1048/1342		4.31	4.27	4.32	3.72
		tions reflect			0	10	2	3	5 5	2	3		1464/1520	3.79	4.18	4.25	4.41	3.92
				hat you learned	0	8	1	4	3	3	-		1235/1465			4.12	4.09	3.53
				what you learned	0	12	0	2	4	4			1167/1434		4.27	4.14	4.05	3.62
		system clearly			0	1	3	4	9	5			1455/1547		4.27	4.19	4.22	
	-	as class cance		nea	0	0	0	0	0	16			1236/1574		4.78	4.64		4.36
	-			ing effectiveness	7	0	1	1		5			1399/1554				4.05	
9. 110W WO	aia you gi	ade the overa.	ii ceacii	ing effectiveness	,	U			10	,	_	3.22	1333/1334	3.31	3.99	4.10	1.05	3.22
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lectures	_	repared	0	0	2	4	15	2	2	2.92	1460/1488	3.96	4.47	4.47	4.44	2.92
		or seem inter			0	0	0	1	4	10	10		1384/1493	4.47	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.16
				plained clearly	0	0	1	4	11	5			1383/1486	3.55	4.17	4.32		3.28
		contribute to			0	0	3	3	7	6			1355/1489		4.27	4.32	4.31	3.36
				ur understanding	1	18	1	2	2	1			****/1277					****
		1			_		_	_	_	_	-		,					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****
				to participate	23	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****
				open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.29	****
													,					
		Labora	cory															
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	15	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	175/ 379	3.99	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.20
	-	_																
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		17	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	227/ 375	3.32	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.38
		Field N	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	18	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	237/ 326	3.07	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.14
		Self 1																
5. Were t	here enoug	h proctors for	r all th	e students	14	0	0	0	8	2	1	3.36	243/ 382	3.32	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.36
				Frequ	ency	r Dist	tribu	utio	n									
	_																	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	1
00 27	1	0 00 0 00	0	A 6			~~~					0	Cwadust		^	 Mo ≐ -		0
00-27	1 5	0.00-0.99	0			кес	quire	eu I	Or M	ajor	5	0	Graduat	E	0	Majo)T.	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B 5 C 3		Con	nera	1				1	IIndox	- ben	E	More	mo i o	25
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99	0	D 0		Ger	nera.	Т				Τ	Under-g	LaU 2	15	NON-	-major	25
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2	D 0 F 0		m1.	ectiv					1	#### 1	Moana +	horo -	ro rot	ono	h
Grad.	U	3.30-4.00	۷			₽16	=C.CT.	ves				т	#### - 1				_	111
				= -		0-1					-	4	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcar	lL	
				I 0		Oti	ner				Τ	4						
				? 1														

Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1058 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		~																
1 Did wa	aain na	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this source	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	818/1576	4.60	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	2	1		1392/1576	4.06	4.29	4.27	4.28	3.50
		lestions reflec			0	0	1	0	4	2			1269/1342	3.91	4.28	4.32	4.20	3.25
	_	ations reflect		-	0	2	0	1	1	2	2		1212/1520	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.25	3.83
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	0		1194/1465	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.63
	-	_		what you learned what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	1		878/1434	4.56	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.00
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	2	3	2		1239/1547	4.27	4.27	4.14	4.15	3.75
	_	was class canc		rnea	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.19	4.21	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2		924/1554		3.99	4.10		4.00
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	II teac	iiing effectiveness	U	U	U	U	2	4	۷	4.00	924/1334	4.05	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.00
		Lectur																
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	5	3		1018/1488	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.38
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.70	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1253/1486	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.75
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1050/1489	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.13
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	3.50
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	3.50	3.63	4.17	4.20	4.00
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3		412/1270	4.54	3.84	4.35	4.42	4.75
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.41	
				_														
5 Were re	emuiremer	Labora	_	early specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4 25	155/ 379	4 13	4 10	4 20	4 17	4 25
J. WCIC I	cquiremer	ics for tab tep	OICB CI	carry specifica	-	O	O	O	O	5	_	1.23	133/ 3/7	1.15	1.10	1.20	1.17	1,23
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear		6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.28	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.00
		Field	Work															
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.14	3.38	4.03	4.23	3.00
		Self	Daged															
5. Were tl	here enou	ugh proctors fo		ne students	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.61	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.00
				_		- ·	,											
				Frequ	ency	DIST	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	8			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	nuir	 ed f	or Ma	iore		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		1,00	74TT	ca I	J_ 1-1G	. ,	_	J	Graduat	_	J	1.100)	<i>,</i> _	3
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Cer	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	8	Non-	-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1		Gel	c.a.	-				5	onder g	Luu	J	14011_) 🗆	J
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 1	F 0		רק.	ecti	7700				1	#### - 1	Meane +	horo -	ra not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	Τ.	P 0		ET.	ECLI.	veb				_					_	111
				- *		O+1	0.00					7	respons	es lo E	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
				= *		OEI	ner					/						
				? 2														

Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Instructor: DRAGANESCU, AND

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1059 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	.1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	277/1576	4.60	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.77
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	608/1576	4.06	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.50
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	3		4.68	381/1342	3.91	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.68
	_	ations reflect		_	1	10	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	464/1520	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.25	4.55
				what you learned	1	4	1	3	4	2	7		1180/1465	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.65
	_	-		o what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	4.56	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.67
		system clearl			1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	-,	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.21	
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	518/1554		3.99	4.10	4.09	4.41
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	505/1488	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.75
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	683/1493	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.85
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	861/1486	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.37
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	513/1489	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.65
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques er	hance y	our understanding	2	15	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/1279			4.17		****
				d to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	1		****/1270		3.84	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.41	****
_		Labora																
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	13	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.13	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.00
F 17		Semina	_		1.0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2 02	106/ 275	2 20	2 07	4 01	4 10	2 02
5. were ci	riteria i	for grading mad	e clear		16	U	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	196/ 375	3.28	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.83
5 Did cor	nferences	Field help you carr		ield activities	15	0	0	0	6	0	1	3 29	207/ 326	3 14	3 38	4 03	4 23	3 29
J. Dia coi	ill CI Cliccb		-	icia accivities	13	O	Ü	Ü	O	O	_	3.27	2017 320	3.11	3.30	1.05	1.23	3.23
5. Were th	here enou	Self agh proctors fo		he students	16	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	219/ 382	3.61	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.50
		-		Frequ	onar	. Diat	- rih	utio	2									
				_	lency	DIS	CTID	ucioi	.1									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	ре 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		_							3	, .				
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C 5		Ger	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0		Q. 1					_	0	respons	es to k	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				2	0						
				? 1														

Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1060 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.60	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	2		1023/1576		4.31	4.27	4.28	4.17
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1110/1342	3.91	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.80
4. Did oth	ner evalu	uations reflect	the expe	cted goals	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.25	4.00
		eadings contribu			0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	850/1465	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434		4.27	4.14	4.15	5.00
		g system clearly		ed	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	527/1547		4.38	4.19	4.21	4.50
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574		4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1166/1554	4.05	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.75
		Lecture																
		actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488		4.47	4.47	4.47	5.00
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	4	2		1321/1493		4.73	4.73	4.70	4.33
		terial presented			0	0	0	1	0	3			1101/1486		4.17	4.32	4.32	4.00
		es contribute to			0	0	0	1	0	2			1020/1489		4.27	4.32	4.34	4.17
. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance you	r understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	****
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu			3	0	0	1	1	1	0		1186/1279		3.63	4.17	4.20	3.00
		nts actively enc			3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	784/1270		3.84	4.35	4.42	4.33
B. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air and	open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	773/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.41	4.33
		Seminar																
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made	clear		4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.28	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.00
	_	Field W																
. Did cor	nferences	s help you carry	out fie	ld activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.38	4.03	4.23	****
		Self P							_									
o. Were th	nere enou	ugh proctors for	all the	students	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	181/ 382	3.61	3.44	4.08	4.24	4.33
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;
 00-27	 0	0.00-0.99	1	A 0		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 r	 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1.0	-1~		10		-	-	or addac.	-	-		_	5
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		001		_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Otl	ner					5	_		5			
				? 1														

Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II

Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1061 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did	aain na	Genera v insights,ski		this source	0	0	0	0	5	0	8	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.30	1 22
		or make clear			0	0	2	1	1	3	8		1307/1576		4.29	4.30	4.30	4.23 3.77
		estions reflect			0	0	1	1	2	4	5		1093/1342		4.28	4.32	4.20	3.77
		ations reflect			0	6	1	0	2	1	3		1276/1520	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.25	3.05
				hat you learned	0	6	0	0	3	0	-		758/1465		3.96	4.12	4.09	4.14
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1		4.50			4.27	4.14		4.50
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	2				399/1547		4.38	4.19		4.62
		vas class cance		inea	1	0	0	0	0	4			911/1574		4.78	4.64		4.67
	-			ing effectiveness	1	0	1	3	1	5			1367/1554			4.10		3.33
J. HOW WO	dia you gi	ade the overa.	ii ceacii	ing effectiveness		U		5		5	2	3.33	1307/1334	3.33	3.99	4.10	4.00	3.33
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture		repared	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1209/1488	4.08	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.08
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	4			1053/1493		4.73	4.73	4.70	4.67
				plained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	5			1400/1486	3.17	4.17		4.32	
		s contribute to			1	0	4	1	2	2			1437/1489		4.27	4.32		2.92
				our understanding	1	6	2	0	1	1			1128/1277					
3. 21a aa		occiminadach cir	101100 70	ar aracrotariaring	_	Ü	_	ŭ	_	_	_	3.1.	1120,12	3.17	3.71	1.05		J. 1
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	10	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.20	****
				l to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.42	****
				l open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.41	****
		_		_														
		Labora																
5. Were r	requirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	6	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	193/ 379	4.14	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.14
		Semina	=															
5. Were c	criteria fo	or grading made	e clear		4	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	250/ 375	3.22	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.22
	_	Field V																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	4	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	4.23	3.33
		Self			_		•		_		_		010/000			4 00		
5. Were t	there enoug	gh proctors for	r all th	e students	6	0	0	0	./	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.00
				T					_									
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cripu	utioi	1									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Por	asons				Ту	20			Majors	
credits E	arneu	Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades					250115	, 				 pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	mire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0		1101	1411	JG	22 110	. ,	_		or adda	_	•	11000	-	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001		_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
	-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I O		Oth	ner				1	1	10050110					
				? 4							_							
				• •														

Course-Section: MATH 306 0101 University of Maryland Title GEOMETRY

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1062

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GARTSIDE, J Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	1	3.44	1470/1576	3.44	4.29	4.30	4.30	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	1		1484/1576		4.31	4.27	4.28	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	4	4		1252/1342		4.28	4.32	4.30	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.18	4.25	4.25	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	1180/1465	3.64	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1397/1434	2.86	4.27	4.14	4.15	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	3	6	3.63	1294/1547	3.63	4.38	4.19	4.21	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	3	4	3	1	2.71	1510/1554	2.71	3.99	4.10	4.09	2.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1215/1488	4.06	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1454/1493	3.75	4.73	4.73	4.70	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	10	2	3.75	1253/1486	3.75	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	2	5	5	3.44	1335/1489	3.44	4.27	4.32	4.34	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	3.63	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1033/1270	3.80	3.84	4.35	4.42	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	852/1269	4.20	3.97	4.35	4.41	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379				4.17	4.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	5	1			220/ 375				4.12	
The Late March														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48		3.00	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44		5.00	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45		5.00	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	3	0	0		****/ 326		3.38	4.03	4.23	****
		-	Ü	Ü	3	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 520		3.30	1.05	1.25	
Self Paced	1 =	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 40	****	2 00	1 60	1 02	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15 15	0	0	0	1 0	0	0 1		****/ 40 ****/ 24		3.00 4.50	4.60 4.83	4.83 4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35			4.63	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	313/ 382		4.00 3.44	4.07	4.24	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	TT	1	U	U	4	U	U	3.00	313/ 302	3.00	3.44	4.00	4.24	3.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3			 mir	ed fo	or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 r	14
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9		100	1411	- L	J. 1.1C	ـــ∪ر ــ	~	-	Sidduat	_	5	1100		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 3		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-9	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	2
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 3 D 0		001		_				-	011002 9			2.011		-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 11 ?

Title COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

Instructor: DRAGANESCU, AND

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 27

DRAGANESCU, AND Spring 2009

Page 1063 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	9	12 16	4.23	976/1576 785/1576		4.29 4.31	4.30 4.27	4.30 4.28	4.23 4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	510/1342		4.28	4.32	4.30	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	848/1520	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.25	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	3	2	0	4	2.92	1413/1465	2.92	3.96	4.12	4.09	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	594/1434		4.27	4.14		4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4		4.70	291/1547	4.70	4.38	4.19		
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1			188/1574		4.78	4.64		4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	6	6	11	4.22	752/1554	4.22	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1		4.73	547/1488		4.47	4.47	4.47	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	708/1493		4.73	4.73	4.70	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	7		4.31			4.17	4.32		4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	0	2		4.52			4.27		4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	585/1277	4.19	3.71	4.03	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.63	4.17	4.20	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	3	0	2	3	3.33	1169/1270	3.33	3.84	4.35	4.42	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	0	1		4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.97	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 878	***	3.91	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	145/ 379	4.29	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.29
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	204/ 375	3.63	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.63
mi al di manda														
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	4.23	3.33
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	2	0	2 45	005/ 200	2 45	2 44	4 00	4 04	2 45
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	10	3	2	3.47	225/ 382	3.47	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.47
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 17														17
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 17 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6		Rec	1urre	ea ro	or Ma	Jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo) Ľ	17
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2		Ger	nera:	1			1	1	Under-q	rad 2	7	Non-	major	10
84-150 10 3.00-3.49 10 D 0		001	.c. a.	_			_	_	onacı 9		•	11011		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 10 F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	rh
P 0									respons				_	•
I 0		Oth	ner				1	4	_		5			
? 0														

University of Maryland Course-Section: MATH 401 0101 Page 1064 MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
O	2	

Title

FIII OTTIMETIC:	2			
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	Λ	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.18	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.96	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1459/1574	4.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554		3.99	4.10	4.24	
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0		1249/1279	2.50	3.63	4.17	4.31	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.84	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.97	4.35	4.55	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.00
	_	Ü	,	Ū	-	,	Ü	2.00		2,00				2.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: MATH 404 0101

INTRO PART DIFF EQ I Baltimore County

Title INTRO PART DIFF Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 1065 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	387/1576		4.29	4.30	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	381/1342		4.28	4.32	4.46	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0			4.71	291/1520		4.18	4.25	4.38	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	3	3	3	5		1341/1465	3.24	3.96	4.12	4.22	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	544/1434		4.27	4.14	4.30	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	708/1547		4.38	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0 1	6 10	15	4.71 4.12	832/1574 860/1554		4.78	4.64 4.10	4.69 4.24	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	Τ	U	1	1	10	5	4.12	860/1554	4.12	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	401/1488	4.81	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	658/1493	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	6	11		1072/1486		4.17	4.32	4.41	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4			813/1489		4.27		4.38	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	3	0	3	5	1	3.08	1144/1277	3.08	3.71	4.03	4.04	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	1238/1279	2.63	3.63	4.17	4.31	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	2	2		1177/1270	3.29	3.84	4.35	4.53	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	0	0	4		1175/1269	3.29	3.97	4.35	4.55	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory			_	•	•	_						4 0 =		
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 240	****		4.35	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	2	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.13
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.27	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 326	****	3.38	4.03	3.97	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	261/ 382	3.29	3.44	4.08	3.88	3.29
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 10 ? 2

Course-Section: MATH 407 0101

MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH

Title Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1066 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

							Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 Genera																
1 Did ro	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	om this source	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	1 17	1042/1576	4.17	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	5		1042/1576		4.31	4.27	4.35	4.17
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25			4.28	4.32	4.46	4.25
		uations reflect			0	6	0	0	0	4			768/1520	4.33	4.18	4.25	4.38	
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	5		454/1465			4.12	4.22	4.4
				to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3			816/1434		4.27	4.14	4.30	
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	3	8		270/1547			4.19	4.24	4.7
		was class canc		illea	1	0	0	0	0	3	-		813/1574		4.78		4.69	
	_			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	5 6	-		1326/1554				4.09	
. 110W WO	ara you s	grade the overa	II ccac	illing clicectveness	_	O	O	_	-	O	O	3.13	1320/1331	3.13	3.77	1.10	1.21	3.1.
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	2	2	1	7		1209/1488	4.08	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.0
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	2			1053/1493			4.73	4.80	4.6
				explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1375/1486		4.17		4.41	3.3
. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	6	0	0	5	3.17	1398/1489	3.17	4.27	4.32	4.38	3.1
. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	***	3.71	4.03	4.04	* * *
		Discus	aion															
Did al	ann dinn			what you learned	8	0	2	1	0	0	1	2 25	1267/1279	2.25	3.63	1 17	4.31	2.2
				ed to participate	8	0	0	1	1	0	2		1054/1270		3.84	4.35	4.53	3.7
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	2		773/1269		3.97		4.55	4.3
		_		d open discussion		3	0	0	0	0				4.33 ****				***
. were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiui		8	3	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 878	^^^	3.91	4.05	4.33	^ ^ ^
		Labora	-															
. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	7	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.0
		Semina	r															
. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear		8	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.0
		Field	Work															
Did co	nferences			ield activities	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.3
Were t	here eno	Self ugh proctors fo		he students	9	0	0	0	3	0	Λ	3.00	313/ 382	3 00	3 44	4 08	3 88	3 0
. WEIE C.	nere eno	ugii proccors ro	ı aıı c	ile studelits	,	U	U	U	5	U	U	3.00	313/ 302	3.00	J.11	4.00	3.00	3.0
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		1/6/	~u++ (-u 1	OT 1,10	نتار	_	5	Graduat	_	5	ra JC	-	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Co	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non	-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gel	ııcı d.	T				I	onder-g	Lau I	. 4	14011-	iiia JUI	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0		17.7	ecti					0	####	Moana +	horo -	.xo xo+	ono	,h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	3			上上	ectl	ves				U	#### - 1				_	111
				P 0		0.3	ı .					7	respons	es to k	e sign	ııııcar	ıü	
				I 0		Ot	her					7						
				? 1														

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Title INTRO ABSTRACT ALGEBR Instructor: TOLL, CHARLES

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

Page 1067 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
		ew insights, skills f		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576		4.29	4.30	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	608/1576		4.31	4.27	4.35	4.50
		uations reflect the		0	1 0	0	0	0 1	1	2	4.67 4.50	339/1520 366/1465	4.67 4.50	4.18 3.96	4.25	4.38	4.67 4.50
		eadings contribute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434		4.27	4.12	4.22	5.00
		g system clearly exp		0	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1434		4.27	4.14	4.30	5.00
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	, -		4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00
			aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		1/1574 194/1554		3.99		4.69	
9. HOW WO	outa you g	grade the overall te	aching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	1	3	4./5	194/1554	4./5	3.99	4.10	4.24	4./5
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	5.00
		ctor seem interested	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
		terial presented and		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.75
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.75
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass disci	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.63	4.17	4.31	4.50
		nts actively encoura		2	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1270	5.00		4.35	4.53	5.00
		ctor encourage fair		2	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	644/1269				4.55	
		-															
F 77		Laboratory	-11161-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	77/270	4 50	4 10	4 00	4 10	4 50
5. were r	equiremen	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.50
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made cle	ar	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.00
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.50	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.50
		0.16.5															
5 Were t	here eno	Self Paced agh proctors for all		2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	185/ 382	4 00	3 44	4 08	3 88	4 00
3		2911 P1000015 101 011	one boundings	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	1.00	100, 501	1.00	3.11	1.00	3.00	1.00
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 0		100	-1011	ca I	O1 110	. ,	_	•	or addact	_	•	1100	-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0													5 2	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
			P 0									respons				_	
			I 0		Ot!	her					1	_		_			
			? 1														

Course-Section: MATH 411 0101 Un Title LINEAR ALGEBRA Instructor: PITTENGER, ARTH

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1068 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16		
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	7

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			 ı															
1 Did wo	u gain not	General insights,skil		thia gourge	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.45
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.45	215/1576	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.45
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	9		179/1342	4.90		4.32	4.46	4.90
		ations reflect			2	2	0	0	0	3	-	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.57
				hat you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2		4.50	366/1465	4.50		4.12	4.22	4.50
				what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3		4.67		4.67		4.14	4.30	4.67
		system clearly			1	0	0	1	3	0		4.10	971/1547			4.19	4.24	4.10
		vas class cance	_	nea	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	5.00
	-			ing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	2				3.99			4.33
J. 110W WO	aia you gi	ade the overa.	LI CEACII	ing effectiveness	J	U	U	U	U	7	2	1.55	023/1334	1.55	3.99	4.10	1.21	1.33
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	5.00
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.80
				olained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3		4.50	678/1486	4.50		4.32	4.41	4.50
		contribute to		-	2	1	0	0	1	1		4.63	552/1489	4.63	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.63
				ur understanding	2	7	0	0	1	0			****/1277	****		4.03	4.04	****
		1	2										•					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	****
				to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	***	3.84	4.35	4.53	****
				open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.55	****
		3		-														
		Laborat																
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.19	***
		Semina	<u>-</u>															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	3.27	4.01	3.90	****
		Field V																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out fig	eld activities	5	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	232/ 326	3.17	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.17
		Self I			_				_	_								
5. Were th	here enoug	gh proctors for	all the	e students	5	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	3.88	3.00
				Ti														
				Frequ	lency	DIS	LIDU	10111	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	:
																		,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			,						,		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	L				5	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 1													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh
				P 2									respons				_	
				I 0		Otł	ner					3			5			
				? 0														

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 1069

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MATH 413 0101

NUMBER THEORY

CAMPBELL, ROBER

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.80
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.60
B. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	709/1342	4.40	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.40
. Did otl	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.60
. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.00
. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.40
. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.80
. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.80
. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.60
		Lectur	е															
. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.80
. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.80
l. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.80
. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	258/1277	4.60	3.71	4.03	4.04	4.60
		Discus	gion															
Did ala	acc dica			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	***
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	***
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	3.97		4.55	***
		Labora	+ 0.307.5															
5. Were re	equiremer		-	early specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.00
	-	_																
. Did an	nforongo	Field		ield activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 326	****	3.38	4 02	3.97	***
). Dia coi	nrerences	s neip you carr	y out i	leid activities	4	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 320		3.30	4.03	3.97	
		Self							_	_								
. Were th	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	182/ 382	4.25	3.44	4.08	3.88	4.25
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
		0.00.0.00		·												 М		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ea I	or Ma	ajor:	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	ъ о		a		1				2	TTrades		_	Mari		0
56-83 84-150	3	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1	C 0 D 0		Gei	nera	T				2	Under-g	Lau	5	NON-	-major	0
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0 F 0		. וים	ecti					0	#### - I	Moana +	horo a	ro not	ono	rh
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	۷	P 0		r.T.	=CL1	ves				U	response				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					2	response	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı	10	
				? 1		ULI	TET					4						
				ť I														

Title HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS

Instructor: Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 6

SEIDMAN, THOMAS

Page 1070 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							_	icres			IIIS	LIUCLOI	Course	e Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
	Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
	new insights, skil			0	0	0	0	0	2	4		415/1576	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the inst	ructor make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam	questions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.60
4. Did other ev	aluations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.67
5. Did assigned	readings contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.00
	assignments contri			0	0	0	0	0	3			398/1434		4.27			4.50
	ing system clearly			0	0	0	0	3	0			1041/1547		4.38	4.19		4.00
	es was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574				4.69	
_	grade the overal		na offoatiwonoaa	1	0	0	0	2	2			1132/1554					
9. How would yo	grade the overal	i teachi	ng effectiveness		U	U	U	4	2		3.00	1132/1334	3.00	3.99	4.10	4.24	3.00
	Lecture																
1 17 11 1			3	_	0	0	0	1	4	1	4 00	1000/1400	4 00	4 47	4 47	4 55	4 00
	tructor's lectures			0	0	0	0	1	4			1233/1488		4.47			4.00
	ructor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1493		4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
	material presented			0	0	0	0	1	2			891/1486				4.41	
	ures contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovis	ual techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.71	4.03	4.04	3.00
	Discuss	sion															
1. Did class di	scussions contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	****
2. Were all stu	dents actively end	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****
	ructor encourage f			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****		4.35		****
	techniques succes		-F	5	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 878	****	3.91		4.33	****
1. Mere apecial	CCCIMITAGES SUCCES	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			Ü	Ū	ŭ	_	Ū	Ů	3.00	, 0.0		3.71	1.05	1.55	
	Laborat	orv															
E Wara raguira	ments for lab repo	-	rly aposified	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	229/ 379	4 00	1 10	1 20	/ 1Q	4 00
J. Were require	ments for tab repo	orts crea.	rry specified	4	U	U	U	U	4	U	4.00	229/ 3/9	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.13	4.00
	Seminar	-															
F Warra arribarri				3	0	0	0	2	1	0	2 22	232/ 375	2 22	2 27	4 01	2 00	2 22
5. were criteri	a for grading made	e crear		3	U	U	U	2	Τ	U	3.33	232/ 3/5	3.33	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.33
	Field W																
5. Did conferen	ces help you carry	out fie	ld activities	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.67
	Self P																
5. Were there e	nough proctors for	all the	students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.44	4.08	3.88	****
			Frequ	lency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;	
00-27 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	5
28-55 0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			_						3		
56-83 0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150 3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		001						-	g.			011		_
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		רם.	ectiv	700				0	#### - I	Maana +	horo -	ra not	- enous	rh
Grau. 0	3.30-4.00	7	P 1		E I t	CCLI	vcb				U					_	111
					0+1	h = r -					2	response	es to I	be sign	itttcai	IL	
			I 0		Otl	her					3						
			? 0														

Course-Section: MATH 479 0101

Title MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S

Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2

Spring 2009

Page 1071 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.44
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	698/1576	4.44	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.44
3. Did t	he exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	****	4.28	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did o	ther evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.80
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.67
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.83
7. Was t	he grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.40
8. How m	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	5.00
	_			ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	827/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.14
		Lectur	ے															
1 Were	the instri	actor's lecture		orepared	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4 00	1233/1488	4.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.00
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
				xplained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.67
		es contribute to			6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.27	4.32		4.33
4. DIG C	ne recture	es contribute to	J WIIAL :	you rearned	0	U	U	U	1	U	۷	4.33	000/1409	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.30	4.33
1 5 1		Discus			_	0	0	-	0	0	2	4 05	665 (1050	4 05	2 62	4 15	4 21	4 05
				what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.63	4.17	4.31	4.25
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.84	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did t.	he instruc	ctor encourage	tair and	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.97	4.35	4.55	5.00
		Labora	_															
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were	assigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was t	he instruc	ctor available :	for ind	ividual attention	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did r	esearch pr	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did p	resentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.67	4.83	4.61	4.52	4.67
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	e clear		5	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	***	3.27	4.01	3.90	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did c	onferences			ield activities	б	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.33
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
	_ ,	Cum. GPA			_			_					_				,	
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors 	; 		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2						
				3 0														

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1072 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	30			
Questionnaires:	18	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101

MATH MODELING

ROSTAMIAN, ROUB

Title

Instructor:

						Fr	eaue:	ncies	5		Ins	tructor		Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean				Mean	Mean		Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	1042/1	576	4.17	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.17
		ctor make clear the		1	0	1	2	1	5	8		1138/1		4.00	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.00
		uestions reflect the		0	16	0	0	0	0	2		****/1		****	4.28	4.32	4.46	****
		uations reflect the		0	1	1	0	1	7	8		880/1		4.24	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.24
		eadings contribute t		0	2	2	1	4	2	7		1152/1		3.69	3.96	4.12	4.22	3.69
			to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	11		270/1		4.67	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.67
		g system clearly exp		0	0	1	3	4	3	7		1276/1		3.67	4.38	4.19	4.24	3.67
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72			4.72	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.72
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall te	eaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1032/1	554	3.93	3.99	4.10	4.24	3.93
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	1095/1	488	4.28	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.28
		ctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1	493	4.72	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.72
		terial presented and	_	1	0	1	1	0	7	8	4.18	1017/1	486	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.18
		es contribute to wha		0	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	941/1	489	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.28
		l techniques enhance		0	2	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	243/1	277	4.63	3.71	4.03	4.04	4.63
		Discussion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1	279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	****
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively encoura	ged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1	270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****
		ctor encourage fair		15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1	269	****	3.97	4.35	4.55	****
		Laboratory																
1. Did th	e lab in	crease understanding	of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	234	****	2.67	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate ba	ckground information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	240	****	3.61	4.35	4.45	****
		materials available		16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	229	****	3.50	4.51	4.70	***
		structor provide ass		16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	232	****	5.00	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were r	equireme	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	186/	379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.17
		Seminar																
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available for i	ndividual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	79	****	4.50	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribute t	o what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made cle	ar	11	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/	375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.00
		Field Work																
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry out	field activities	14	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/	326	****	3.38	4.03	3.97	****
		Self Paced	l															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute t	o what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did st	udy ques	tions make clear the	expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for all	the students	9	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	313/	382	3.00	3.44	4.08	3.88	3.00
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	 A 8								1				 0	Na		8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	A 8 B 8		Ke	quir	eu f	or Ma	ijor	Ď	т	Grad	uale	=	U	Majo	JΤ	ŏ
56-83	3 9	2.00-2.99 2 3.00-3.49 6	C 1 D 0		Ger	nera	1				6	Unde	r-gı	rad 1	L8	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0				13.7	00+1					1	шшпп		Moor- 1	horr			.h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00 8	F 0 P 0		E10	ecti	ves				1			Means t			_	111
			P 0		0.1						_	resp	onse	es to k	be sigr	ııııcar	10	

Other

9

I 0

? 1

Course-Section: MATH 611 0101 University of Maryland Title APPLIED ANALYSIS

Baltimore County Spring 2009

ZWECK, JOHN Instructor:

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Page 1073 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did	vou gain ne	General w insights,skil		his course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.43	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1576		4.31			5.00
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.33			4.28	4.32		4.33
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	1		4.50	511/1520		4.18			4.50
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1434		4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	1			339/1547			4.19	4.24	
		was class cance	_	a	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574		4.78		4.75	
	-			g effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1554				4.18	
		Lecture																
1 Were	the instru	ctor's lectures		pared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4 67	4.47	4.47	4.52	4 67
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1493	5.00		4.73		
		erial presented			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.33	,	4.33	4.17		4.37	
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1489				4.38	
4. DIG	the recture.	s concribate to	wilac you	Tearmed	U	U	U	U	U	U	J	3.00	1/1409	3.00	1.2/	1.52	1.50	3.00
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did	class discu	ssions contribu		t vou learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.63	4.17	4.34	4.50
		ts actively enc		-	1	0	0	0	0	1			636/1270	4.50		4.35	4.53	
		tor encourage fa			2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269		3.97		4.55	
		chniques succes		pen dibedbbien	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 878				4.11	
i. were	bpcciai cc	cimitques bucces	DIGI		_	O	Ü	J	Ü	O	_	3.00	1, 0,0	3.00	3.71	1.05		3.00
		Laborate	ory															
5. Were	requiremen	ts for lab repo	rts clear	ly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.00
	_	_																
		Seminar																
5. Were	criteria f	or grading made	clear		2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00
		Field W																
5. Did	conferences	help you carry	out fiel	d activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	3.38	4.03	4.10	5.00
			_															
F		Self Pa		. 1	-	•	•	•	-	0	-	4 00	105/ 200	4 00	2 44	4 00	4 10	4 00
5. Were	there enoug	gh proctors for	all the	students	1	0	0	0	1	0	Τ	4.00	185/ 382	4.00	3.44	4.08	4.13	4.00
				Freq	ıency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduate	e	2	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			_			_						J -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouq	h
				P 0									response				_	
				I O		Otł	ner					2	-		3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MATH 612 0101 Title

ORDINARY DIFFERENTIAL

Instructor: HOFFMAN, KATHLE

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1074 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	 1															
1	Did vou	aain ne	Genera. w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.67
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576		4.31	4.27	4.32	5.00
			estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342		4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00
			ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520		4.18	4.25	4.36	5.00
					hat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	571/1465	4.33	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.33
					what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00
7.	Was the	grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00
8.	How man	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.67
9.	How wou	ld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.33
			Lecture	е															
			actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488		4.47	4.47	4.52	5.00
			ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493		4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
					plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486		4.17	4.32	4.37	4.67
			es contribute to	_		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	500/1489		4.27	4.32	4.38	4.67
5.	Did aud	iovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.71	4.03	4.08	5.00
			Labora	tory															
5.	Were re	quiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.00
			Semina	r															
5.	Were cr	iteria f	for grading made	e clear		1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00
			Self 1	Paced															
5.	Were th	ere enou	gh proctors for	r all th	e students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	4.13	3.00
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Cre	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	}
		0	0 00 0 00													1			
	1-27 3-55	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 3 B 0		Rec	4urr.	eu I	or Ma	JOES	5	0	Graduat	E	1	Majo	,т	2
	i-33	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	1
	-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		GEI	лста.	_				۷	onder -g.	Luu	۷	IVOII-	ilia joi	_
	ad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
31		-	3.33 1.30	-	P 0								-	respons				_	
					I O		Oth	ner					1			3			
					? 0														

Course-Section: MATH 625 0101 University of Maryland Title COMP MATH & C PROG Baltimore County

Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB Spring 2009

Enrollment: 6

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1075 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 5 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1465 **** 3.96 4.12 4.25 **** 1/1434 5.00 4.27 4.14 4.35 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 838/1547 4.25 4.38 4.19 4.24 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.78 4.64 4.75 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 395/1554 4.50 3.99 4.10 4.18 4.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 505/1488 4.75 4.47 4.47 4.52 4.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.73 4.73 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 339/1486 4.75 4.17 4.32 4.37 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.27 4.32 4.38 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1277 5.00 3.71 4.03 4.08 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 445/1279 4.50 3.63 4.17 4.34 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 3.84 4.35 4.53 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 3.97 4.35 4.55 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 3 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 878 **** 3.91 4.05 4.11 **** Laboratory 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.10 4.20 4.37 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3 0 0 3.00 287/ 375 3.00 3.27 4.01 4.10 3.00 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 326 **** 3.38 4.03 4.10 **** Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 313/382 3.00 3.44 4.08 4.13 3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 627 0101 University of Maryland Title INTR PARALLEL COMP GOBBERT, MATTHI

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

Page 1076 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Comman	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain new	insights,ski	lls from	this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	t the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalua	tions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.80
5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1465	4.80	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.80
6. Did wri	itten assi	gnments contr.	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.80
8. How mar	ny times w	as class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wou	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.60
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.80
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.60
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.71	4.03	4.08	4.80
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.34	****
				to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****
				open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	***	3.97	4.35	4.55	***
F 17		Labora	_		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4 00	000/ 270	4 00	4 10	4 00	4 27	4 00
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	U	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.00
Г Мана ж		Semina: r grading mad			3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	180/ 375	4 00	2 27	4 01	4 10	4 00
5. Were Cr	riceria 10.	r grading mad	e Clear		3	U	U	U	Τ.	U	1	4.00	100/ 3/3	4.00	3.47	4.01	4.10	4.00
5 Did gor	nferences	Field I		eld activities	3	0	0	0	2	0	Λ	3 00	251/ 326	3 00	3 38	4 N3	4 10	3 00
J. Dia coi	illerences .	ncip you carr	y out ii	cia accivities	3	O	Ü	U	2	O	Ü	3.00	231/ 320	3.00	3.30	1.05	1.10	3.00
		Self																
		-		hat you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.50	****
		ts with the in			4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.33	****
5. Were th	here enoug	h proctors for	r all th	e students	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.44	4.08	4.13	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors				
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4							 ed fa	or Ma	iors		 1	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1,00	1411	-u 1)_ 1·1a	ء ـ ٠	,	_	Gradati	_	5	1-10.) (<i>,</i> _	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	C_ u.	_				-	0113C1 9.		_	2,011		_
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enona	h
9 0 P 0								. 22				_	response				_	
I 0						Oth	ner					0	10050110		91			
? 0						001						-						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title MATRIX ANALYSIS Instructor: MINKOFF, SUSAN

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Enrollment: 12 Ouestionnaires: 10

Course-Section: MATH 630 0101

Page 1077 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1576		4.29	4.30	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1576		4.31	4.27	4.32	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	797/1342		4.28	4.32	4.38	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1465	4.29	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	473/1434		4.27	4.14	4.35	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1547		4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574		4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.90	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1486	4.90	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	812/1277		3.71			3.89
~.														
Discussion	4	0	^	0	_	_	0	4 00	000/1070	4 00	2 (2	4 1 1	1 21	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2 1	2	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.63	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0 1	0	0 1	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	3.84	4.35		4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	U T	0	_	_	4.33	773/1269	4.33	3.97		4.55	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	Т	U	U	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	* * * *	3.91	4.05	4.11	* * * *
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.37	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.76	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****
			0	0	4	0	0		251/ 326		3.38	4.03	4.10	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			U	U	7	U	U	5.00	231/ 320	3.00	5.50	1.03	1.10	3.00
Self Paced			_											
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40		3.00	4.60	4.50	****

4 1 0 Frequency Distribution

0 5 0 0 3.00 313/382 3.00 3.44 4.08 4.13 3.00

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

Title FOUNDTNS OF OPTIMIZATI

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1078 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Frequencies			Instructor			Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	n Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	u gain no	Genera w insights,ski		m this sourse	0	0	2	1	2	2	1	2 / 5	1463/157	6 2 1	5 4.29	4.30	4.43	3.45
		tor make clear			0	0	3	0	5	1			1545/157		1 4.31			
		estions reflect			0	0	2	1	1	3			1199/134		5 4.28			3.55
		ations reflect			0	2	2	0	2	3			1418/152		3 4.18			3.33
				what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3			1004/146		3.96			3.89
				what you learned		2	1	1	1	3			1142/143		7 4.27			
		system clearly			0	0	0	2					1211/154		2 4.38		4.24	
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	0	2			645/157		2 4.78			
				ning effectiveness	3	0	4	0	2	2			1542/155					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							-	U	2	2	U	2.25	1342/13	T 2.2.	3.99	4.10	4.10	2.23
		Lecture	е															
		ctor's lecture			0	0	2	1	3	3	2		1435/148		3 4.47	4.47	4.52	3.18
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	784/149	3 4.8	2 4.73	4.73	4.80	4.82
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						1	4	1	2	3	3.18	1396/148	6 3.1	3 4.17	4.32	4.37	3.18
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						4	1	1	2	3	2.91	1440/148	9 2.9	L 4.27	4.32	4.38	2.91
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dican			what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	0	Λ	2 00	1270/127	9 2 0	3.63	4 17	4.34	2.00
				d to participate	5	0	2	0	4	0			1255/127		3.84			
				d open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	1			1210/126		3.97			
3. DIG CII	e mstruc	tor encourage .	Lair and	open discussion	,	U	U	Τ.	2	_	U	3.00	1210/120	9 3.00	3.91	4.33	4.55	3.00
		Labora																
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	105/ 37	9 4.4	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.40
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made			8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	203/ 37	5 3.6	7 3.27	4.01	4.10	3.67
	_	Field W				_			_									
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	ield activities	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	6 ***	* 3.38	4.03	4.10	****
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for	r all th	ne students	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	219/ 38	2 3.5	3.44	4.08	4.13	3.50
				Frequ	onar	Diat	-rib	u+ i 01	^									
				rrequ	lency	DIS		ucioi	11									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				7	ype			Majors	5
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						 mii r	 ed f	or Ma	iore		0	 Gradua		4	 Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		re(1u11	cu I	or Ma	ניסרי	,	U	G1 auuc		7	ria J	J.	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Cer	nera	1				2	Under-	arad	7	Non-	-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 1		001	icia.	-				_	OHAGE	51 aa	,	14011		J
	Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 4 F 2						acti	ves				0	#### -	Meang	there	are not	enous	rh
91au. 4 3.30 4.00 4 F 2						Electives						0		#### - Means there are not enough cesponses to be significant			7	
				I 0		Ot.ì	ner					6	100201		~ 519			
				5 0		001						-						
				. 0														

Course-Section: MATH 710A 0101

Title MULTISCALE OPTIMIZATIO

Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1079 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
				Freq	iencies	

Ouestions	3					ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	972/1342		4.28	4.32	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1		1041/1520	4.00	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.50
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		238/1547	4.75	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.71	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	55/ 379	4.67	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.67
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00
• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_		-		-	-	-							
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	3.38	4.03	4.10	3.67
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtion	า									
Frequency Distribution														

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