

Course-Section: MATH 100 01
 Title Intro To Contemp Math
 Instructor: Kogan, Jacob
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 910
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	8	6	3.69	1280/1447	3.65	4.19	4.31	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	8	10	3.92	1123/1447	3.76	4.15	4.27	4.30	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	272/1241	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	923/1402	3.83	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	869/1358	3.76	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	968/1316	3.54	4.10	4.14	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	668/1427	4.34	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	194/1447	4.89	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	0	7	12	3	3.58	1198/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	4.10	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	9	10	4.13	1131/1387	3.90	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	6	14	4.33	1229/1387	4.19	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	7	5	7	3.50	1258/1386	3.47	3.96	4.32	4.32	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	3	11	3.83	1138/1380	3.92	4.06	4.32	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/1193	2.89	3.69	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	0	5	5	4	3.41	1021/1172	3.66	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	746/1182	3.82	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	600/1170	4.04	3.93	4.38	4.17	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	9	14	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	15	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 100 02
 Title Intro To Contemp Math
 Instructor: Rostamian,Roube
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 911
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	11	10	6	3.60	1310/1447	3.65	4.19	4.31	4.18	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	11	8	7	3.60	1286/1447	3.76	4.15	4.27	4.30	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	19	4.33	717/1241	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1238/1402	3.83	4.11	4.24	4.15	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	4	7	4	6	3.57	1138/1358	3.76	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	1	4	5	2	3.29	1216/1316	3.54	4.10	4.14	3.99	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	18	4.33	680/1427	4.34	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	2	26	4.83	700/1447	4.89	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	11	4	2	3.39	1281/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	4.10	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	3	5	10	6	3.68	1277/1387	3.90	4.40	4.46	4.46	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	0	3	8	10	4.04	1313/1387	4.19	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	8	9	3	3.43	1275/1386	3.47	3.96	4.32	4.32	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	5	6	10	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	14	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1119/1193	2.89	3.69	4.02	3.99	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	801/1172	3.66	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1106/1182	3.82	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1032/1170	4.04	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 14	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 106 01
 Title Algebra & Element Func
 Instructor: Sharma, Neeraj
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 912
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	8	16	15	4.02	1047/1447	4.36	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	14	19	4.19	911/1447	4.48	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	10	24	4.31	743/1241	4.53	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	3	0	10	6	12	3.77	1153/1402	4.19	4.11	4.24	4.15	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	3	2	5	5	6	3.43	1203/1358	4.09	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	3	1	4	5	5	3.44	1156/1316	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	18	16	4.20	842/1427	4.44	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	1	0	0	0	38	4.90	511/1447	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	9	13	12	4.09	807/1434	4.38	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	11	23	4.56	727/1387	4.71	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	8	25	4.61	1042/1387	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	8	13	14	4.11	997/1386	4.46	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	8	23	4.50	659/1380	4.57	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	18	2	2	3	2	9	3.78	831/1193	4.00	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	593/1172	4.22	3.62	4.15	3.95	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	3	3	2	5	3.69	1029/1182	4.10	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	925/1170	4.12	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	29	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	3.54	3.53	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	4.47	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 192	4.80	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	4.77	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.73	4.73	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 106 01
 Title Algebra & Element Func
 Instructor: Sharma, Neeraj
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 912
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	13	General	15	Under-grad	42	Non-major	42
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	3	18	4.48	612/1447	4.36	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	561/1447	4.48	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	523/1241	4.53	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	725/1402	4.19	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	387/1358	4.09	3.95	4.11	4.03	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	283/1316	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	385/1427	4.44	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	194/1447	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	278/1434	4.38	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	383/1387	4.71	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	814/1387	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	510/1386	4.46	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	560/1380	4.57	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	759/1193	4.00	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	3	3	9	3.89	812/1172	4.22	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	521/1182	4.10	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	845/1170	4.12	3.93	4.38	4.17	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	581/ 800	3.54	3.53	4.06	3.95	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 189	4.47	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 192	4.80	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.77	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	4.73	4.73	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	4.50	4.50	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 106 02
 Title Algebra & Element Func
 Instructor: Potharaju, Pavan
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 913
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	21	4.58	496/1447	4.36	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	228/1447	4.48	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	261/1241	4.53	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	494/1402	4.19	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	474/1358	4.09	3.95	4.11	4.03	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	486/1316	4.16	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	19	4.57	385/1427	4.44	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1447	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	11	16	4.46	386/1434	4.38	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	353/1387	4.71	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	844/1387	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	431/1386	4.46	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	21	4.63	506/1380	4.57	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	433/1193	4.00	3.69	4.02	3.99	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	366/1172	4.22	3.62	4.15	3.95	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	844/1182	4.10	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	725/1170	4.12	3.93	4.38	4.17	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	1	3	0	2	3	3.33	701/ 800	3.54	3.53	4.06	3.95	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	93/ 189	4.47	4.47	4.34	4.18	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	34/ 192	4.80	4.80	4.34	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	2	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	50/ 186	4.77	4.77	4.48	4.46	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	4	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	57/ 187	4.73	4.73	4.33	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	5	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	47/ 168	4.50	4.50	4.20	4.29	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 106 03
 Title Algebra & Element Func
 Instructor: Riley, Samantha
 Enrollment: 102
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 914
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	14	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 115 01
 Title Finite Mathematics
 Instructor: Kapoor, Jagmohan
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 915
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	154/1447	4.85	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	325/1358	4.54	3.95	4.11	4.03	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	292/1427	4.65	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	270/1434	4.61	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	291/1387	4.84	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	889/1387	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	539/1386	4.58	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	366/1380	4.74	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.69	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	463/1172	4.40	3.62	4.15	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	521/1182	4.56	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	710/1170	4.33	3.93	4.38	4.17	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 10	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MATH 132 01
 Title Math For Elem Tchrs II
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 916
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	13	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	327/1447	4.69	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	427/1241	4.63	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	1	1	7	3.69	1063/1358	3.69	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.10	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.25	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.70	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	460/1387	4.73	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	630/1387	4.87	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	607/1386	4.50	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	366/1380	4.73	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	262/1193	4.55	3.69	4.02	3.99	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	841/1172	3.83	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.80	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	3.93	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.53	4.06	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	4	6	17	25	4.15	963/1447	4.17	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	5	6	19	22	4.06	1023/1447	4.17	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	1	7	11	30	4.17	844/1241	4.27	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	3	1	8	10	19	4.00	976/1402	4.05	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	3	1	12	13	14	3.79	994/1358	3.77	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	23	2	3	5	8	11	3.79	973/1316	3.98	4.10	4.14	3.99	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	0	5	16	28	4.47	513/1427	4.42	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	1	2	48	4.87	592/1447	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	4	2	0	4	12	11	4.03	833/1434	4.05	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	6	9	35	4.53	769/1387	4.64	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	4	5	40	4.73	889/1387	4.77	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	8	12	27	4.31	839/1386	4.22	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	3	8	33	4.35	807/1380	4.45	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	16	4	1	4	6	16	3.94	726/1193	3.94	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	3	10	6	18	3.76	881/1172	3.60	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	5	0	11	11	14	3.71	1027/1182	3.54	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	3	10	9	16	3.78	981/1170	3.60	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	17	18	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	562/ 800	3.58	3.53	4.06	3.95	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 150 01
 Title Precalculus Mathematic
 Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala
 Enrollment: 140
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 917
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	10	Under-grad	55	Non-major	53
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	12	22	42	4.18	936/1447	4.17	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	15	21	44	4.29	814/1447	4.17	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	11	17	50	4.38	683/1241	4.27	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	4	15	17	30	4.11	910/1402	4.05	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	23	5	8	6	14	23	3.75	1022/1358	3.77	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	31	0	6	6	10	26	4.17	700/1316	3.98	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	5	9	18	49	4.37	632/1427	4.42	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	2	2	5	70	4.81	727/1447	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	3	1	11	24	26	4.06	817/1434	4.05	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	6	9	66	4.74	444/1387	4.64	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	7	69	4.81	758/1387	4.77	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	4	16	16	40	4.13	988/1386	4.22	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	9	9	58	4.54	615/1380	4.45	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	17	4	5	9	11	28	3.95	716/1193	3.94	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	8	8	19	19	19	3.45	1011/1172	3.60	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	11	9	17	14	22	3.37	1110/1182	3.54	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	10	11	12	15	23	3.42	1094/1170	3.60	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	12	46	4	5	2	8	7	3.35	699/ 800	3.58	3.53	4.06	3.95	3.35
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	3	1	1	1	5	3.36	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	73	4	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	73	5	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	73	5	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	78	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	78	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	78	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	79	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	80	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	79	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	80	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	80	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 150 06
 Title Precalculus Mathematic
 Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala
 Enrollment: 151
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 918
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	30	0.00-0.99	3	A	25	Required for Majors	68	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	9	C	23	General	4	Under-grad	84	Non-major	84
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 151 01
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J
 Enrollment: 151
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 919
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	15	46	4.55	529/1447	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	13	49	4.59	436/1447	4.29	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	18	42	4.39	666/1241	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	1	1	7	17	18	4.14	882/1402	4.07	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	31	0	3	12	8	15	3.92	893/1358	3.71	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	44	1	1	2	6	15	4.32	557/1316	4.03	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	22	36	4.37	644/1427	4.04	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	6	61	4.87	592/1447	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	5	27	25	4.35	516/1434	4.15	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	8	55	4.76	414/1387	4.73	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	63	4.93	422/1387	4.86	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	7	15	45	4.57	548/1386	4.22	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	7	6	53	4.66	477/1380	4.38	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	26	4	2	9	8	16	3.77	837/1193	3.87	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	1	13	23	17	3.73	890/1172	4.02	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	6	15	18	18	3.75	1014/1182	3.71	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	5	4	14	11	24	3.78	983/1170	3.80	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	10	35	6	3	7	3	5	2.92	760/ 800	3.38	3.53	4.06	3.95	2.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	18	0.00-0.99 2	A 11	Required for Majors 45	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 6	C 20	General 6	Under-grad 69 Non-major 66
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 15	D 5		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	12	34	41	4.26	869/1447	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	11	30	44	4.26	853/1447	4.29	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	33	44	4.33	726/1241	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	2	6	8	17	31	4.08	929/1402	4.07	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	6	12	14	26	12	3.37	1220/1358	3.71	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	59	0	5	7	11	6	3.62	1075/1316	4.03	4.10	4.14	3.99	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	16	27	38	4.08	931/1427	4.04	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	4	0	7	76	4.78	786/1447	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	1	9	26	35	4.29	589/1434	4.15	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	5	21	61	4.60	656/1387	4.73	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	5	11	71	4.73	904/1387	4.86	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	18	19	46	4.22	911/1386	4.22	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	9	20	53	4.41	759/1380	4.38	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	32	6	5	9	17	15	3.58	936/1193	3.87	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	10	29	36	4.22	607/1172	4.02	3.62	4.15	3.95	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	4	17	20	35	4.05	844/1182	3.71	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	15	22	34	4.08	854/1170	3.80	3.93	4.38	4.17	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	15	49	1	4	4	6	11	3.85	542/ 800	3.38	3.53	4.06	3.95	3.85
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	89	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 151 06
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J
 Enrollment: 146
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 920
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	24	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	69	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	B	28						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	9	C	20	General	3	Under-grad	90	Non-major	86
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Course-Section: MATH 151 11
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I
 Instructor: Gloor, Philip J.
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 921
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	17	4.18	945/1447	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	12	14	4.03	1041/1447	4.29	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	15	11	3.97	942/1241	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.25	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	8	2	10	4.00	976/1402	4.07	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	2	5	8	8	3.83	966/1358	3.71	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	710/1316	4.03	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	12	6	10	3.69	1192/1427	4.04	4.25	4.19	4.24	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	565/1447	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	7	9	9	3.82	1038/1434	4.15	3.91	4.10	4.10	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	337/1387	4.73	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	369/1387	4.86	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	5	8	14	3.88	1141/1386	4.22	3.96	4.32	4.32	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	5	17	4.06	1010/1380	4.38	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	3	9	13	4.27	470/1193	3.87	3.69	4.02	3.99	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	672/1172	4.02	3.62	4.15	3.95	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1113/1182	3.71	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1051/1170	3.80	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	3.38	3.53	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 152 01
 Title Calc & Analy Geometry
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J
 Enrollment: 154
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 922
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	27	54	4.56	529/1447	4.39	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	18	63	4.66	352/1447	4.35	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	2	19	57	4.46	599/1241	4.19	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	36	2	0	8	18	22	4.16	854/1402	4.07	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	36	1	3	12	13	20	3.98	834/1358	3.95	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	53	0	2	6	10	15	4.15	710/1316	4.11	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	11	26	48	4.41	596/1427	4.26	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	1	3	80	4.91	485/1447	4.92	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	1	2	3	25	40	4.42	431/1434	4.15	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	15	65	4.68	536/1387	4.57	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	10	75	4.88	579/1387	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	31	48	4.48	635/1386	4.08	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	14	64	4.62	520/1380	4.09	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	32	1	5	6	14	24	4.10	612/1193	3.42	3.69	4.02	3.99	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	11	14	18	12	19	3.19	1070/1172	3.76	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	9	11	20	20	14	3.26	1121/1182	3.73	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	9	5	20	19	19	3.47	1079/1170	3.95	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	13	56	2	3	5	5	2	3.12	****/ 800	3.00	3.53	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	29	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	76	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	20	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	22	General	0	Under-grad	86	Non-major	79
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	17	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MATH 152 01
 Title Calc/Analy Geom II-Hon
 Instructor: Hoffman, Kathlee
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 923
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.39	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.35	4.15	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	4.19	4.31	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1402	4.07	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1358	3.95	3.95	4.11	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1316	4.11	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	237/1427	4.26	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	619/1447	4.92	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	4.15	3.91	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.57	4.40	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1386	4.08	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	4.09	4.06	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.42	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	648/1172	3.76	3.62	4.15	3.95	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	3.73	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	3.95	3.93	4.38	4.17	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	3.53	4.06	3.95	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 152 06
 Title Calc & Analy Geometry
 Instructor: Gloor, Philip J.
 Enrollment: 162
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 924
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	7	18	21	19	3.76	1257/1447	4.39	4.19	4.31	4.18	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	13	21	14	15	3.38	1355/1447	4.35	4.15	4.27	4.30	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	7	13	21	15	10	3.12	1209/1241	4.19	4.31	4.33	4.25	3.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	3	5	11	10	10	3.49	1268/1402	4.07	4.11	4.24	4.15	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	17	6	8	9	12	13	3.38	1220/1358	3.95	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	2	4	7	4	10	3.59	1092/1316	4.11	4.10	4.14	3.99	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	10	19	19	17	3.66	1201/1427	4.26	4.25	4.19	4.24	3.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	63	4.98	97/1447	4.92	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	5	10	21	12	5	3.04	1346/1434	4.15	3.91	4.10	4.10	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	6	13	19	27	4.03	1166/1387	4.57	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	11	52	4.75	859/1387	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	10	11	22	9	12	3.03	1326/1386	4.08	3.96	4.32	4.32	3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	18	11	20	6	9	2.64	1348/1380	4.09	4.06	4.32	4.31	2.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	13	7	10	11	7	2.83	1126/1193	3.42	3.69	4.02	3.99	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	4	4	12	16	3.95	764/1172	3.76	3.62	4.15	3.95	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	6	4	13	9	5	3.08	1136/1182	3.73	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	4	4	9	9	11	3.51	1066/1170	3.95	3.93	4.38	4.17	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	31	23	1	2	6	2	2	3.15	****/ 800	3.00	3.53	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	66	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	18	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	22	General	1	Under-grad	67	Non-major	65
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	14	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	25	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	11	12	17	3.89	1174/1447	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	13	18	3.91	1141/1447	4.25	4.15	4.27	4.30	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	14	18	4.02	914/1241	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	2	4	14	11	4.10	916/1402	4.22	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	2	10	10	11	3.91	917/1358	4.05	3.95	4.11	4.03	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	1	2	4	4	8	3.84	944/1316	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.99	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	8	11	23	4.36	656/1427	4.48	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	2	37	4.90	485/1447	4.88	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	3	2	6	10	6	3.52	1233/1434	3.93	3.91	4.10	4.10	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	3	6	27	4.41	891/1387	4.63	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	7	27	4.62	1030/1387	4.79	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	2	6	12	12	3.72	1202/1386	4.19	3.96	4.32	4.32	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	3	3	10	20	4.22	924/1380	4.50	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	14	0	3	3	7	9	4.00	652/1193	3.88	3.69	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/1172	4.05	3.62	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	****/1182	4.55	3.80	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/1170	4.45	3.93	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	36	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 155 01
 Title Elementary Calculus
 Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala
 Enrollment: 90
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 925
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 155 02
 Title Elementary Calculus
 Instructor: Kelly, Brian
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 926
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	11	14	4.28	849/1447	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.18	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	447/1447	4.25	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	241/1241	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.25	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	665/1402	4.22	4.11	4.24	4.15	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	663/1358	4.05	3.95	4.11	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	564/1316	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.99	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	337/1427	4.48	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	592/1447	4.88	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	540/1434	3.93	3.91	4.10	4.10	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	276/1387	4.63	4.40	4.46	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	211/1387	4.79	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	431/1386	4.19	3.96	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	299/1380	4.50	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	1	3	5	11	3.75	843/1193	3.88	3.69	4.02	3.99	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	3	4	12	4.05	694/1172	4.05	3.62	4.15	3.95	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55	527/1182	4.55	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	616/1170	4.45	3.93	4.38	4.17	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	7	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.46	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: MATH 155 02
 Title Elementary Calculus
 Instructor: Kelly, Brian
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 926
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	0	6	7	25	4.24	879/1447	4.24	4.19	4.31	4.31	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	5	29	4.55	479/1447	4.55	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	5	30	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.31	4.33	4.35	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	0	5	2	17	4.36	655/1402	4.36	4.11	4.24	4.24	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	1	1	3	4	20	4.41	441/1358	4.41	3.95	4.11	4.12	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	1	3	2	14	4.29	590/1316	4.29	4.10	4.14	4.08	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	3	7	26	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	34	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	3	3	10	13	4.14	765/1434	4.14	3.91	4.10	3.97	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	3	30	4.70	506/1387	4.70	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	9	25	4.59	1063/1387	4.59	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	4	27	4.54	568/1386	4.54	3.96	4.32	4.24	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	5	3	28	4.54	615/1380	4.54	4.06	4.32	4.30	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	3	3	4	0	13	3.74	855/1193	3.74	3.69	4.02	4.04	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	600/1172	4.22	3.62	4.15	4.12	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	3	0	5	2	8	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	3.80	4.35	4.30	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	1	5	1	10	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.93	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	24	8	1	1	3	0	5	3.70	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: MATH 215 1
 Title Finite Math For Info S
 Instructor: Kapoor, Jagmohan
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 927
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	42
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 01
 Title Intro To Linear Algebr
 Instructor: Lo,James T
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 928
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	9	10	3	3.54	1327/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	8	5	3.50	1323/1447	4.06	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	10	7	4	3.46	1154/1241	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.35	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	3	5	1	3	3.33	1307/1402	3.93	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	7	10	3	3.80	987/1358	4.06	3.95	4.11	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	4	6	3	3.35	1192/1316	3.80	4.10	4.14	4.08	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	8	10	3.96	1024/1427	4.23	4.25	4.19	4.14	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.94	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	6	6	9	0	2.96	1365/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	2.96

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	5	7	7	3.63	1292/1387	4.08	4.40	4.46	4.42	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	9	12	4.25	1260/1387	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	5	4	8	4	3.30	1293/1386	3.60	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	2	6	8	3.42	1267/1380	3.82	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	4	1	0	0	2	2.29	1170/1193	2.97	3.69	4.02	4.04	2.29

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1172	3.22	3.62	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1182	3.87	3.80	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1170	3.93	3.93	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 17	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 12					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 1					

Course-Section: MATH 221 02
 Title Intro To Linear Algebr
 Instructor: Guler,Osman
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 929
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	4	4	3.63	1303/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.06	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	969/1241	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.35	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1245/1402	3.93	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	1212/1358	4.06	3.95	4.11	4.12	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1247/1316	3.80	4.10	4.14	4.08	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	936/1427	4.23	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	388/1447	4.94	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	3	5	3	1	2.73	1390/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1176/1387	4.08	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	1260/1387	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	4	3	2	2.80	1345/1386	3.60	3.96	4.32	4.24	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	2	5	3.44	1262/1380	3.82	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1072/1193	2.97	3.69	4.02	4.04	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1172	3.22	3.62	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/1182	3.87	3.80	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1170	3.93	3.93	4.38	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 221 03
 Title Intro To Linear Algebr
 Instructor: Peercy,Bradford
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 930
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	507/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	24	4.61	426/1447	4.06	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	30	4.79	251/1241	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.35	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	2	2	20	4.64	336/1402	3.93	4.11	4.24	4.24	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	332/1358	4.06	3.95	4.11	4.12	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	423/1316	3.80	4.10	4.14	4.08	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	23	4.55	410/1427	4.23	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.88	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	12	11	4.31	578/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	490/1387	4.08	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	29	4.82	758/1387	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	548/1386	3.60	3.96	4.32	4.24	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	392/1380	3.82	4.06	4.32	4.30	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	3	8	6	7	3.50	960/1193	2.97	3.69	4.02	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1172	3.22	3.62	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1182	3.87	3.80	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1170	3.93	3.93	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	29
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 13	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 221 04
 Title Intro To Linear Algebr
 Instructor: Potra, Florian A
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 931
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	7	13	4.04	1042/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	6	14	4.11	983/1447	4.06	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	18	4.41	658/1241	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	891/1402	3.93	4.11	4.24	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	1	3	15	4.38	474/1358	4.06	3.95	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	2	4	9	4.06	785/1316	3.80	4.10	4.14	4.08	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	5	16	4.15	882/1427	4.23	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	388/1447	4.94	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	0	4	12	5	3.67	1150/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	3	8	11	3.92	1217/1387	4.08	4.40	4.46	4.42	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	1	3	19	4.42	1191/1387	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	5	6	9	3.64	1225/1386	3.60	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	4	8	10	3.77	1165/1380	3.82	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1193	2.97	3.69	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1083/1172	3.22	3.62	4.15	4.12	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	941/1182	3.87	3.80	4.35	4.30	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	798/1170	3.93	3.93	4.38	4.32	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors		24	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General		0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1118/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	1023/1447	4.06	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	833/1241	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.35	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	976/1402	3.93	4.11	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	672/1358	4.06	3.95	4.11	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	812/1316	3.80	4.10	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	582/1427	4.23	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.94	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1066/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1131/1387	4.08	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	1203/1387	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1214/1386	3.60	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	6	5	3.75	1169/1380	3.82	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1193	2.97	3.69	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1042/1172	3.22	3.62	4.15	4.12	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	979/1182	3.87	3.80	4.35	4.30	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1013/1170	3.93	3.93	4.38	4.32	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.38	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MATH 225 01
 Title Intro Differentl Equat
 Instructor: Lo,James T
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 933
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	8	9	8	3.55	1327/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	11	5	3.42	1347/1447	3.65	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	10	7	8	3.47	1152/1241	3.86	4.31	4.33	4.35	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	1	3	6	2	3.36	1301/1402	3.74	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	5	7	3	8	3.50	1170/1358	3.75	3.95	4.11	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	7	8	1	3.39	1180/1316	3.79	4.10	4.14	4.08	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	6	7	11	3.67	1201/1427	3.57	4.25	4.19	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	194/1447	4.74	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	5	12	8	1	2.97	1361/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	2.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	9	10	6	3.61	1297/1387	3.98	4.40	4.46	4.42	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	1072/1387	4.49	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	2	10	9	3	3.18	1311/1386	3.39	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	9	8	5	3.29	1293/1380	3.70	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	25	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1193	3.50	3.69	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 225 02
 Title Intro Differentl Equat
 Instructor: Gobbert,Matthia
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 934
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	8	15	4.13	980/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	10	9	9	3.77	1224/1447	3.65	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	11	2	14	3.90	989/1241	3.86	4.31	4.33	4.35	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	6	7	6	3.90	1076/1402	3.74	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	681/1358	3.75	3.95	4.11	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	758/1316	3.79	4.10	4.14	4.08	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	10	10	8	3.83	1130/1427	3.57	4.25	4.19	4.14	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	339/1447	4.74	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	8	9	4	3.50	1238/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	18	7	4.00	1176/1387	3.98	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	4	2	6	16	4.10	1303/1387	4.49	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	7	11	6	5	3.23	1302/1386	3.39	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	6	8	9	3.53	1237/1380	3.70	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	4	4	5	5	10	3.46	975/1193	3.50	3.69	4.02	4.04	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors	
-----		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 23		Graduate	0	Major 5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 9					
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	1	C 6	General 0		Under-grad 30		Non-major 25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other 1				
				? 0					

Course-Section: MATH 225 03
 Title Intro Differentl Equat
 Instructor: Chin,Sang H.
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 935
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	9	21	15	4.13	980/1447	3.94	4.19	4.31	4.31	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	17	14	11	3.75	1228/1447	3.65	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	9	10	17	17	4.22	806/1241	3.86	4.31	4.33	4.35	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	11	9	12	3.97	1016/1402	3.74	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	2	4	7	6	9	3.57	1138/1358	3.75	3.95	4.11	4.12	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	3	7	13	9	3.88	927/1316	3.79	4.10	4.14	4.08	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	9	15	10	7	3.20	1341/1427	3.57	4.25	4.19	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	25	18	4.33	1202/1447	4.74	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	2	8	13	12	4.00	849/1434	3.49	3.91	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	16	21	4.33	980/1387	3.98	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	36	4.79	799/1387	4.49	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	8	18	11	3.74	1195/1386	3.39	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	6	10	24	4.28	868/1380	3.70	4.06	4.32	4.30	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	24	0	5	4	2	6	3.53	953/1193	3.50	3.69	4.02	4.04	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	38	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.46	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	38
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 13		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 251 01
 Title: Multivariable Calculus
 Instructor: Lynn, Yen-mow
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 936
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	11	5	4.11	998/1447	3.98	4.19	4.31	4.31	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1105/1447	3.70	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	717/1241	4.02	4.31	4.33	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1088/1402	3.86	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	799/1358	3.89	3.95	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	910/1316	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.08	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	328/1427	4.22	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1168/1447	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	5	7	1	1	2.53	1405/1434	3.07	3.91	4.10	3.97	2.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1137/1387	3.86	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	1210/1387	4.40	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	8	4	3	1	2.61	1362/1386	2.96	3.96	4.32	4.24	2.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	7	3	1	2.67	1346/1380	3.00	4.06	4.32	4.30	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1193	3.43	3.69	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1165/1172	2.56	3.62	4.15	4.12	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1177/1182	2.90	3.80	4.35	4.30	2.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1151/1170	3.09	3.93	4.38	4.32	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MATH 251 02
 Title: Multivariable Calculus
 Instructor: Seidman, Thomas
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 937
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1058/1447	3.98	4.19	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1286/1447	3.70	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1074/1241	4.02	4.31	4.33	4.35	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1094/1402	3.86	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	1	6	2	3.50	1170/1358	3.89	3.95	4.11	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	617/1316	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	3	3.53	1249/1427	4.22	4.25	4.19	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	4	1	3.23	1317/1434	3.07	3.91	4.10	3.97	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	3	5	2	3.07	1347/1387	3.86	4.40	4.46	4.42	3.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1055/1387	4.40	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	4	5	1	3.00	1328/1386	2.96	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	5	1	2.93	1324/1380	3.00	4.06	4.32	4.30	2.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1041/1193	3.43	3.69	4.02	4.04	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1172	2.56	3.62	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1078/1182	2.90	3.80	4.35	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1170	3.09	3.93	4.38	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	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	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	5	9	3.83	1222/1447	3.98	4.19	4.31	4.31	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	8	5	3.57	1300/1447	3.70	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	4	11	4.00	923/1241	4.02	4.31	4.33	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	4	0	1	6	3.82	1132/1402	3.86	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	681/1358	3.89	3.95	4.11	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	729/1316	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	434/1427	4.22	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	436/1447	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.70	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	6	6	2	3.44	1265/1434	3.07	3.91	4.10	3.97	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	911/1387	3.86	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	1276/1387	4.40	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	6	3	7	3.26	1298/1386	2.96	3.96	4.32	4.24	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	3	4	8	3.41	1270/1380	3.00	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	927/1193	3.43	3.69	4.02	4.04	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1079/1172	2.56	3.62	4.15	4.12	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1140/1182	2.90	3.80	4.35	4.30	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1103/1170	3.09	3.93	4.38	4.32	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.57	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	342/1447	4.69	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	702/1447	4.44	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	380/1241	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	249/1402	4.32	4.11	4.24	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	387/1358	4.48	3.95	4.11	4.10	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	342/1316	4.68	4.10	4.14	4.13	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	459/1427	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	291/1447	4.97	4.88	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	230/1434	4.47	3.91	4.10	4.09	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	353/1387	4.84	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	630/1387	4.91	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	510/1386	4.52	3.96	4.32	4.30	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	463/1380	4.64	4.06	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1193	****	3.69	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	5.00	3.80	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	4.60	3.93	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	4.73	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 301 01
 Title Intro Math Analysis I
 Instructor: Draganescu, Andr
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 939
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 301 02
 Title Intro Math Analysis I
 Instructor: Shen,Jinglai
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 940
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	408/1447	4.69	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	532/1447	4.44	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	717/1241	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1076/1402	4.32	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	345/1358	4.48	3.95	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	128/1316	4.68	4.10	4.14	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	283/1427	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1447	4.97	4.88	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	623/1434	4.47	3.91	4.10	4.09	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	230/1387	4.84	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.91	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	691/1386	4.52	3.96	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	534/1380	4.64	4.06	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1193	****	3.69	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.80	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	522/1170	4.60	3.93	4.38	4.49	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	179/1447	4.87	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	45/1447	4.97	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	204/1241	4.84	4.31	4.33	4.33	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	56/1402	4.95	4.11	4.24	4.24	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	3	2	3	7	3.75	1022/1358	3.75	3.95	4.11	4.10	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	81/1316	4.89	4.10	4.14	4.13	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	9	21	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	194/1447	4.97	4.88	4.69	4.65	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	61/1434	4.93	3.91	4.10	4.09	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.40	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	136/1386	4.90	3.96	4.32	4.30	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.06	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	168/1193	4.70	3.69	4.02	4.05	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors		24	Graduate	4	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General		1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	9
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives		3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MATH 306 01
 Title Geometry
 Instructor: Seidman,Thomas
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 942
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1377/1447	3.27	4.19	4.31	4.32	3.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	1	2	2.73	1422/1447	2.73	4.15	4.27	4.23	2.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1106/1241	3.64	4.31	4.33	4.33	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	1	2	3	1	2.80	1382/1402	2.80	4.11	4.24	4.24	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1050/1358	3.71	3.95	4.11	4.10	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	1	3	0	2.50	1299/1316	2.50	4.10	4.14	4.13	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	1	6	1	3.18	1344/1427	3.18	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	5	3	1	0	2.40	1412/1434	2.40	3.91	4.10	4.09	2.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	3	2	1	1	2.27	1381/1387	2.27	4.40	4.46	4.44	2.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1173/1387	4.45	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	0	2	4	0	2.45	1370/1386	2.45	3.96	4.32	4.30	2.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1371/1380	2.00	4.06	4.32	4.32	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1193	****	3.69	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 341 01
 Title Computational Methods
 Instructor: Minkoff, Susan E
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 943
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	626/1447	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	947/1447	4.16	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	692/1241	4.37	4.31	4.33	4.33	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1188/1402	3.70	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	4	6	3	3.53	1156/1358	3.53	3.95	4.11	4.10	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	774/1316	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.13	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	434/1427	4.53	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	817/1434	4.06	3.91	4.10	4.09	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	536/1387	4.68	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	814/1387	4.79	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	911/1386	4.21	3.96	4.32	4.30	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	582/1380	4.58	4.06	4.32	4.32	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	3.69	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MATH 385 01
 Title Intro To Math Modeling
 Instructor: Bell,Jonathan
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 944
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1427/1447	2.89	4.19	4.31	4.32	2.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	1413/1447	2.89	4.15	4.27	4.23	2.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.31	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1183/1402	3.71	4.11	4.24	4.24	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1278/1358	3.13	3.95	4.11	4.10	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1240/1316	3.17	4.10	4.14	4.13	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	0	2	3.00	1359/1427	3.00	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1048/1447	4.56	4.88	4.69	4.65	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1337/1434	3.13	3.91	4.10	4.09	3.13

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1233/1387	3.89	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1229/1387	4.33	4.66	4.73	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1303/1386	3.22	3.96	4.32	4.30	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1360/1380	2.43	4.06	4.32	4.32	2.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1146/1193	2.67	3.69	4.02	4.05	2.67

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	3.62	4.15	4.24	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1011/1182	3.75	3.80	4.35	4.42	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1070/1170	3.50	3.93	4.38	4.49	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 404 01
 Title Intro Part Diff Eq I
 Instructor: Bell,Jonathan
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 945
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	9	13	4.38	715/1447	4.38	4.15	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	10	13	4.46	599/1241	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.41	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	807/1402	4.21	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	4	1	1	4	6	3.44	1199/1358	3.44	3.95	4.11	4.15	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	653/1316	4.21	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	10	11	4.28	739/1427	4.28	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	538/1447	4.88	4.88	4.69	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	6	10	6	3.72	1110/1434	3.72	3.91	4.10	4.17	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	460/1387	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	946/1387	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	8	5	7	3.65	1223/1386	3.65	3.96	4.32	4.34	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	1016/1380	4.04	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	3	4	4	1	5	3.06	1081/1193	3.06	3.69	4.02	4.00	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 6 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 407 01
 Title Modern Algebra & No.Th
 Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 946
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1210/1447	3.80	4.15	4.27	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	872/1241	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.41	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	201/1358	4.71	3.95	4.11	4.15	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1320/1434	3.22	3.91	4.10	4.17	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	902/1387	4.40	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	1203/1387	4.40	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1306/1386	3.20	3.96	4.32	4.34	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	1317/1380	3.00	4.06	4.32	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1193	****	3.69	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.62	4.15	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	691/1182	4.33	3.80	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.93	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 408 01
 Title Intro Abstract Algebr
 Instructor: Toll,Charles
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 947
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.15	4.27	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.11	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.67	3.95	4.11	4.15	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	237/1427	4.71	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1434	4.86	3.91	4.10	4.17	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.40	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	171/1386	4.88	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1193	****	3.69	4.02	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 409 01
 Title Intro To Math Logic
 Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 948
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1182/1447	3.88	4.19	4.31	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1161/1447	3.88	4.15	4.27	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	782/1241	4.25	4.31	4.33	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	854/1402	4.17	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	663/1358	4.20	3.95	4.11	4.15	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	671/1316	4.20	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1259/1427	3.50	4.25	4.19	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	1175/1434	3.63	3.91	4.10	4.17	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	931/1387	4.38	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1298/1387	4.13	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1258/1386	3.50	3.96	4.32	4.34	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	3	1	3.00	1317/1380	3.00	4.06	4.32	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	960/1193	3.50	3.69	4.02	4.00	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 411 01
 Title Linear Algebra
 Instructor: Potra, Florian A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 949
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1290/1447	3.67	4.19	4.31	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	619/1447	4.44	4.15	4.27	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	611/1241	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.41	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	736/1358	4.11	3.95	4.11	4.15	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1117/1434	3.71	3.91	4.10	4.17	3.71

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.89	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	997/1386	4.11	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	3.69	4.02	4.00	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	999/1172	3.50	3.62	4.15	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	3.80	4.35	4.49	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1013/1170	3.67	3.93	4.38	4.51	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 423 01
 Title Differential Geometry
 Instructor: Zweck,John W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 950
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	276/1447	4.79	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.15	4.27	4.31	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	251/1241	4.79	4.31	4.33	4.41	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	452/1358	4.40	3.95	4.11	4.15	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	444/1316	4.45	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	823/1427	4.21	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	270/1434	4.62	3.91	4.10	4.17	4.62

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	596/1387	4.64	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	607/1386	4.50	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	299/1380	4.79	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	3.69	4.02	4.00	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 3	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

Course-Section: MATH 432 01
 Title History Of Mathematics
 Instructor: Rathinam,Muruha
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 951
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	562/1447	4.52	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	7	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.15	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	882/1241	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.41	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	910/1402	4.11	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	772/1358	4.06	3.95	4.11	4.15	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	635/1316	4.24	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	620/1427	4.38	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1137/1434	3.69	3.91	4.10	4.17	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1179/1387	4.44	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	733/1386	4.41	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	323/1193	4.46	3.69	4.02	4.00	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1170	****	3.93	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 481 01
 Title Math Modeling
 Instructor: Rostamian,Roube
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 952
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	540/1447	4.55	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	834/1447	4.27	4.15	4.27	4.31	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.31	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	655/1402	4.36	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	1246/1358	3.27	3.95	4.11	4.15	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	265/1316	4.64	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1077/1427	3.91	4.25	4.19	4.20	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	341/1434	4.50	3.91	4.10	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	611/1387	4.64	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	470/1386	4.64	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1380	4.73	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	149/1193	4.73	3.69	4.02	4.00	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.62	4.15	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	979/1182	3.83	3.80	4.35	4.49	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.93	4.38	4.51	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MATH 484 01
 Title Stochastic Methods
 Instructor: Kang,Weining
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 953
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1114/1447	3.94	4.15	4.27	4.31	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1126/1241	3.56	4.31	4.33	4.41	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1163/1402	3.75	4.11	4.24	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.95	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	572/1316	4.30	4.10	4.14	4.27	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	596/1427	4.40	4.25	4.19	4.20	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1316/1447	4.13	4.88	4.69	4.72	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1223/1434	3.54	3.91	4.10	4.17	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	958/1387	4.69	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1022/1386	4.06	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1081/1380	3.94	4.06	4.32	4.34	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	960/1193	3.50	3.69	4.02	4.00	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1170/1172	1.80	3.62	4.15	4.25	1.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1174/1182	2.40	3.80	4.35	4.49	2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	1151/1170	2.80	3.93	4.38	4.51	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	6	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 611 01
 Title Applied Analysis
 Instructor: Gowda,Muddappa
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 954
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1447	4.89	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	261/1241	4.78	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1022/1358	3.75	3.95	4.11	4.26	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.89	4.25	4.19	4.25	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	3.91	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1387	4.89	4.40	4.46	4.51	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.78	3.96	4.32	4.43	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.06	4.32	4.38	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1172	****	3.62	4.15	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	3.80	4.35	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	3.93	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MATH 627 01
 Title Intr Parallel Comp
 Instructor: Gobbert,Matthia
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 955
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.31	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	938/1358	3.88	3.95	4.11	4.26	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	775/1427	4.25	4.25	4.19	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.88	4.69	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	3.91	4.10	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1131/1387	4.13	4.40	4.46	4.51	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	988/1386	4.13	3.96	4.32	4.43	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	984/1380	4.13	4.06	4.32	4.38	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	224/1193	4.60	3.69	4.02	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.62	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	856/1182	4.00	3.80	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	763/1170	4.25	3.93	4.38	4.52	4.25
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.80	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.77	4.48	4.73	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.50	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: MATH 627 01
 Title Intr Parallel Comp
 Instructor: Gobbert,Matthia
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 955
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 630 01
 Title Matrix Analysis
 Instructor: Draganescu, Andr
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 956
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	375/1447	4.69	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	413/1447	4.62	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	272/1241	4.77	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	700/1358	4.15	3.95	4.11	4.26	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	352/1316	4.55	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	191/1427	4.77	4.25	4.19	4.25	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	819/1447	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.74	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	254/1434	4.64	3.91	4.10	4.21	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	414/1387	4.77	4.40	4.46	4.51	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	844/1387	4.77	4.66	4.73	4.81	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	663/1386	4.46	3.96	4.32	4.43	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	626/1380	4.54	4.06	4.32	4.38	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	401/1193	4.36	3.69	4.02	4.02	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.62	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	788/1182	4.17	3.80	4.35	4.46	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	965/1170	3.83	3.93	4.38	4.52	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.53	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 650 01
 Title Foundtns Of Optimizati
 Instructor: Guler,Osman
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 957
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1230/1447	3.82	4.19	4.31	4.46	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1239/1447	3.73	4.15	4.27	4.30	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1170/1358	3.50	3.95	4.11	4.26	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1172/1316	3.40	4.10	4.14	4.34	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1090/1427	3.89	4.25	4.19	4.25	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1018/1447	4.60	4.88	4.69	4.74	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1073/1434	3.78	3.91	4.10	4.21	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1018/1387	4.64	4.66	4.73	4.81	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	1287/1386	3.36	3.96	4.32	4.43	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1258/1380	3.45	4.06	4.32	4.38	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	4	2	2	2	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	3.69	4.02	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1058/1172	3.25	3.62	4.15	4.32	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1133/1182	3.13	3.80	4.35	4.46	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1070/1170	3.50	3.93	4.38	4.52	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	562/ 800	3.80	3.53	4.06	4.10	3.80

Frequency Distribution

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