Course-Section: PHYS 100 0101 University of Maryland

Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS Baltimore County Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL Fall 2005

Enrollment: 89
Questionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1308 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	13	17	4.35	829/1674	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.07	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	248/1674	4.77	4.04	4.23	4.16	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	310/1423	4.71	4.12	4.27	4.16	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	1	1	3	3	9		1061/1609	4.06	4.08	4.22	4.05	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	9	4	12	3.89	926/1585	3.89	3.80	3.96	3.88	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	1	0	3	1	5		1022/1535	3.90	4.04	4.08	3.89	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	27	4.73	265/1651	4.73	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	6	24		1103/1673	4.64	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	200/1656	4.74	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.74
Tashiina														
Lecture	2	0	0	0	1	_	27	176	474/1506	176	4 2 5	4 42	4 27	176
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6 0	27 35	4.76 5.00	474/1586	4.76	4.35 4.50	4.43	4.37 4.60	4.76 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	1/1585 286/1582	5.00 4.77	3.99	4.69 4.26	4.17	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	27	4.71	423/1575	4.71	4.03	4.27	4.17	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	4	13	16	4.71	406/1380		3.76	3.94	3.78	4.36
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	U	U	U	4	13	10	4.30	400/1360	4.30	3.70	3.34	3.70	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	2	11	9	4.13	760/1520	4.13	3.47	4.01	3.76	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	746/1515	4.42	3.97	4.24	3.97	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	696/1511	4.46	3.88	4.27	4.00	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	13	11	2	0	4	1	5	3.58	705/ 994	3.58	3.82	3.94	3.73	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar	2.0	0	-	•	-	0	0	2 50		de de de de	ale ale ale ale	4 41	4 22	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	2	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32 32	2 2	0	0	0	0 1	2 1	3.00	****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	****	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	2	U	U	U	1	Т	4.50	/ 9/			4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	1	1	1	0	1		,	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
1. 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1		_	•	Ū	Ū	-	_	1.50	, 10			,	1.55	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Course-Section: PHYS 100 0101
Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS

Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL

Enrollment: 89
Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1308 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	 А	15	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

University of Maryland IDEAS IN ASTRONOMY Baltimore County

Title Instructor: DYMSKI, TERRANC

Enrollment: 123 Questionnaires: 60

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1309 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	4	12	18	21	3 86	1347/1674	3.86	4.28	4.27	4.07	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	2	7	19	27		1060/1674	4.12	4.04	4.23	4.16	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	6	12	36	4.34		4.34	4.12	4.27	4.16	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	36	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	645/1609	4.41	4.08	4.22	4.05	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	20	4	3	12	7	12		1211/1585	3.53	3.80	3.96	3.88	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	49	0	0	2	3	3		****/1535	****	4.04	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	5	10	42	4.59	419/1651	4.59	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	38		1061/1673	4.68	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	0	3	13	15	8		1267/1656			4.07	3.96	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	3	12	38	4.59	763/1586	4.59	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	2	10	41	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	2	7	13	29	4.29	903/1582	4.29	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	2	1	0	11	12	27	4.25	958/1575	4.25	4.03	4.27	4.17	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	2	3	10	17	17	3.90	803/1380	3.90	3.76	3.94	3.78	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	16	1	5	2	6		1485/1520		3.47	4.01	3.76	2.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	17	1	7	0	5		1489/1515	2.17	3.97	4.24	3.97	2.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	15	4	6	0	4		1494/1511	2.10	3.88	4.27	4.00	2.10
4. Were special techniques successful	29	27	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	3	0	3	0	1	2.43	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	5	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	, -	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	4	0	2	0	0	1.67	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	,	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	,	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	***	****	4.34	3.88	***

Course-Section: PHYS 105 0101
Title IDEAS IN ASTRONOMY

Instructor: DYMSKI, TERRANC

Enrollment: 123
Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1309 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	Α	16	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	16	General	10	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101 University of Mary Title BASIC PHYSICS I Baltimore Count Instructor: SIMON, JASON PK Fall 2005

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 40

230

University of Maryland Page 1310
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescronnarie

	Frequencies In					Tnat	tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDO	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	_		_											
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	8	13	12	4		1595/1674		4.28	4.27	4.07	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	Ţ	2	14	10	12		1364/1674	3.59	4.04	4.23	4.16	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	22	2	Τ	7	3	4		1311/1423	3.51	4.12	4.27	4.16	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	13	6	12		1423/1609	3.34	4.08	4.22	4.05	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	5	5	12	Τ	8		1429/1585	2.85	3.80	3.96	3.88	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	6	9	9	10		1284/1535	3.23	4.04	4.08	3.89	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	8	13	11		1398/1651	3.98	3.94	4.18	4.10	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0 10	1	36	4.89	724/1673	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	10	16	2	3.66	1302/1656	3.20	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	8	12	8	3.83	1391/1586	3.76	4.35	4.43	4.37	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	2	8	9	12	4.00	1472/1585	3.91	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	2	11	10	7	3.73	1314/1582	3.40	3.99	4.26	4.17	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	3	8	7	10	3.67	1329/1575	3.35	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	14	3	6	4	1	2	2.56	1316/1380	2.71	3.76	3.94	3.78	2.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	3	11	0	2	2 94	1390/1520	2.87	3.47	4.01	3.76	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	6	8	0	2		1459/1515	2.94	3.97	4.24	3.97	2.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	3	4	6	2	2		1465/1511	2.84	3.88	4.27	4.00	2.76
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	0	3	2	2	4		687/ 994		3.82	3.94	3.73	3.64
Laboratory		_	_			_	_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	2	4	10	8	5	3.34	249/ 265	3.15	3.98	4.23	3.97	3.34
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	2	0	6	9	12	4.00	188/ 278	3.92	3.69	4.19	3.97	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	7	3	17	4.29	186/ 260	4.32	4.19	4.46	4.41	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	1	6	5	16	4.17	174/ 259	3.98	3.90	4.33	4.19	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	2	1	10	6	10	3.72	190/ 233	3.86	3.64	4.20	4.00	3.72
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9			 quir					2	Graduat		0	 Majo		0
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 15									Graduati	C	U	ria JC	, 1	U

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				2	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101
Title BASIC PHYSICS I

Title BASIC PHYSICS I Instructor: DYMSKI, TERRANC

Enrollment: 230
Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1311 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	14	17	35	15	20	3.10	1617/1674	3.15	4.28	4.27	4.07	3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	17	23	31	22	3.42	1535/1674	3.59	4.04	4.23	4.16	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	5	15	20	26	33	3.68	1209/1423	3.51	4.12	4.27	4.16	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	49	12	6	9	13	11	3.10	1551/1609	3.34	4.08	4.22	4.05	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	20	27	8	19	15	9	2.63	1537/1585	2.85	3.80	3.96	3.88	2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	40	10	13	13	15	7	2.93	1459/1535	3.23	4.04	4.08	3.89	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	4	14	25	55	4.34	768/1651	3.98	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	4	0	0	0	6	88	4.94	494/1673	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	12	20	33	16	3	2.74	1602/1656	3.20	3.87	4.07	3.96	2.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	9	25	35	25	3.69	1433/1586	3.76	4.35	4.43	4.37	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	11	24	29	32	3.82	1520/1585	3.91	4.50	4.69	4.60	3.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	15	15	30	25	13	3.06	1498/1582	3.40	3.99	4.26	4.17	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	18	23	17	15	24	3.04	1481/1575	3.35	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	67	8	4	6	4	6	2.86	1275/1380	2.71	3.76	3.94	3.78	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	8	4	7	8	3		1424/1520	2.87	3.47	4.01	3.76	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	70	0	3	6	11	8	4		1409/1515	2.94	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	70	0	6	6	10	5	5		1447/1511	2.84	3.88	4.27	4.00	2.91
4. Were special techniques successful	71	27	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 994	3.64	3.82	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory							_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	1	11	9	12	15	7	2.96	258/ 265	3.15	3.98	4.23	3.97	2.96
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	7	12	19	17	3.84	215/ 278	3.92	3.69	4.19	3.97	3.84
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	1	2	4	17		4.36	168/ 260	4.32	4.19	4.46	4.41	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	10	5	2	7	30	3.78	217/ 259	3.98	3.90	4.33	4.19	3.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	1	7	7	15	24	4.00	150/ 233	3.86	3.64	4.20	4.00	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	98	2	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	98	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
		3	0	0		0	-		,	****	****			****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98 98	2	0	0	1	-	0		****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	98 98	2	1	0	0	2	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	90	2	Τ	U	U	U	1	3.00	/ 9/			4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	99	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33		****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	2	0	1	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	1	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	J 0	_	_	U	U	_		٥. ٥٥	/ 49			1.4/	1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	98	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	98	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	98	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	98	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101
Title BASIC PHYSICS I
Instructor: DYMSKI, TERRANC
Enrollment: 230

Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1311 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	Α	35	Required for Majors	8	Graduate 0	Major	1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	В	28					
56-83	25	2.00-2.99	10	C	24	General	0	Under-grad 102	Non-major	101
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	19	D	1					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means ther	e are not enoug	gh
				P	0			responses to be s	ignificant	
				I	0	Other	82	_		
				?	3					

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 87
Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 1312 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	4	10	30	4.59	497/1674	4.59	4.28	4.27	4.07	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	10	30	4.59	471/1674	4.59	4.04	4.23	4.16	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	10	31	4.65	390/1423	4.65	4.12	4.27	4.16	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	5	6	23	4.53	466/1609	4.53	4.08	4.22	4.05	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	7	11	22	4.38	442/1585	4.38	3.80	3.96	3.88	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	13	1	0	6	8		4.17	757/1535	4.17	4.04	4.08	3.89	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	4	7		4.64		4.64	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	212/1673	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	310/1656	3.99	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	64/1586	4.30	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	43	5.00	1/1585	4.31	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	6	33	4.71	366/1582	3.98	3.99	4.26		3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	34	4.79	311/1575	4.79	4.03	4.27	4.17	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	3	7	28	4.59	253/1380	4.59	3.76	3.94	3.78	4.59
Discussion	0.0	0	-	0	0	_		4 20	E00/1E00	4 20	2 45	4 01	2 56	4 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	589/1520	4.32	3.47	4.01	3.76	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	733/1515	4.42	3.97	4.24	3.97	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28 28	0 11	1 0	0	3 1	4	11 5	4.26	886/1511 ****/ 994	4.26 ****	3.88	4.27	4.00	4.26 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	11	U	U	Τ	2	5	4.50	***/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.73	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	3	1	6	12	10	3.78	209/ 265	3.78	3.98	4.23	3.97	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	2	4	13	12	4.03	186/ 278	4.03	3.69	4.19	3.97	4.03
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	3	4	8	17	4.22	196/ 260	4.22	4.19	4.46	4.41	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	5	1	6	7	13	3.69	222/ 259	3.69	3.90	4.33	4.19	3.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	4	8	6	13	3.81	182/ 233	3.81	3.64	4.20	4.00	3.81
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.07	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	***

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor:

Enrollment: 87 Questionnaires: 47

MCMILLAN, WALLA (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1312 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101 Title

BASIC PHYSICS II Instructor:

Enrollment: 87

FRENCH, JOSEPHG (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1313 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	4	10	30	4.59	497/1674	4.59	4.28	4.27	4.07	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	10	30	4.59	471/1674		4.26	4.27	4.07	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	10	31	4.65	390/1423	4.65	4.12	4.23	4.16	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	5	6	23	4.53	466/1609	4.53	4.12	4.22	4.10	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	7	11	22	4.38	442/1585	4.38	3.80	3.96	3.88	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	13	1	0	6	8		4.17	757/1535	4.17	4.04	4.08	3.89	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	4	7	31	4.64	- ,	4.64	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	212/1673	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	2	2	0	5	3	3		1427/1656		3.87	4.07		3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	1	2	3	2	5		1457/1586		4.35	4.43	4.37	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	1	2	2	4	4		1544/1585	4.31	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	3	0	3	3	3		1472/1582		3.99	4.26	4.17	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	2	1	2	1	5		****/1575	4.79	4.03	4.27	4.17	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	5	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1380	4.59	3.76	3.94	3.78	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	589/1520	4.32	3.47	4.01	3.76	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	733/1515	4.42	3.97	4.24	3.97	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	886/1511	4.26	3.88	4.27	4.00	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	28	11	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.73	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	3	1	6	12	10	3.78	209/ 265	3.78	3.98	4.23	3.97	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	2	4	13	12	4.03	186/ 278	4.03	3.69	4.19	3.97	4.03
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	3	4	8	17	4.22			4.19	4.46	4.41	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	5	1	6	7	13	3.69	222/ 259	3.69	3.90	4.33	4.19	3.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	4	8	6	13	3.81	182/ 233		3.64	4.20	4.00	3.81
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	***

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: FRENCH, JOSEPHG (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 87 Questionnaires: 47 Baltimore County

Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 1313 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

21 0101 University of Maryland UUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 134
Questionnaires: 91

Fall 2005

Page 1314 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	27	57	4.53	570/1674		4.28	4.27	4.07	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	21	64	4.67	365/1674	4.19	4.04	4.23	4.16	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	28	57	4.56	517/1423	4.20	4.12	4.27	4.16	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	42	0	1	4	14	27	4.46	567/1609	4.04	4.08	4.22	4.05	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	2	3	14	21	30	4.06	735/1585	3.97	3.80	3.96	3.88	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	32	1	1	4	23	27	4.32	588/1535	4.11	4.04	4.08	3.89	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	32	56	4.60	393/1651	4.29	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	89	4.98	212/1673	4.89	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	1	23	48	4.65	266/1656	4.04	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	7	78	4.86	284/1586	4.35	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	82	4.94	340/1585	4.46	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	24	60	4.64	467/1582	4.22	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	14	68	4.67	495/1575	4.07	4.03	4.27	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	40	3	1	3	13	26	4.26	480/1380	3.69	3.76	3.94	3.78	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	5	24	20	27	3.70	1074/1520	3.58	3.47	4.01	3.76	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	5	5	11	26	34	3.98	1057/1515	3.93	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	6	8	15	20	30		1221/1511	3.79	3.88	4.27	4.00	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	11	37	1	4	3	17	18	4.09	447/ 994	3.95	3.82	3.94	3.73	4.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	87	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	88	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	88	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.41	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	88	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	00	2	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 9/			4.14	3.09	
Field Work					_	_	•							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	89	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 134
Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1314 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	Α	27	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	3	В	38						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	12	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	91	Non-major	84
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	77				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 134 Questionnaires: 91

Fall 2005

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1315 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	es		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	^	1	1	4	0.77		4 52	EDO /1604	4 00	4 00	4 07	4 07	4 52
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1 1	1	4	27	57	4.53	570/1674		4.28	4.27	4.07	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		-	0	-	_	21	64	4.67	365/1674		4.04	4.23	4.16	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0 42	0	2 1	3 4	28	57 27	4.56	517/1423		4.12	4.27	4.16 4.05	4.56 4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	2	3	14	14 21	30	4.46	567/1609 735/1585	4.04	4.08	4.22	3.88	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		32	1	1	4	23	27	4.06			4.04	4.08	3.89	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1	3 Z 0	0	0	2	32	56	4.60	,		3.94	4.18	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	89		212/1673		4.82	4.69	4.10	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		2	0	0	15	30			1260/1656		3.87		3.96	4.19
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultures	5 12	2	U	Ü	13	30		3.72	1200/1030	1.01	3.07	1.07	3.50	1.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	49	0	0	2	8	23	9	3.93	1356/1586	4.35	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	50	0	0	2	8	16	15	4.07	1460/1585	4.46	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	49	0	1	2	9	20	10	3.86	1244/1582	4.22	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	49	1	3	4	5	18	11	3.73	1299/1575	4.07	4.03	4.27	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	49	23	3	2	6	3	5	3.26	****/1380	3.69	3.76	3.94	3.78	4.26
Discussion			_	_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	5	24	20	27		1074/1520		3.47	4.01	3.76	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	5	5	11	26	34		1057/1515		3.97	4.24	3.97	3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	6	8	15	20	30		1221/1511	3.79	3.88	4.27	4.00	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	11	37	1	4	3	17	18	4.09	447/ 994	3.95	3.82	3.94	3.73	4.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	87	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
	-	_		-	_	_	_		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	88	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
	89	1	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****			****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	++++	4.12 4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conterences help you carry out field activities	89	Τ	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	***/ 49			4.27	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	89	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 134
Questionnaires: 91

124

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1315 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	А	27	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	3	В	38						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	12	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	91	Non-major	84
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	77				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: Anderson, Eric (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 139 Questionnaires: 60

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1316 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	15	28	4.03	1171/1674	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.07	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	8	10	18	20	3.70	1401/1674	4.19	4.04	4.23	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	8	10	13	26	3.85	1131/1423	4.20	4.12	4.27	4.16	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	5	12	11	12	3.62	1405/1609	4.04	4.08	4.22	4.05	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	5	8	19	23	3.88	926/1585	3.97	3.80	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	3	8	8	16	3.89	1030/1535	4.11	4.04	4.08	3.89	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	7	17	27	3.98	1123/1651	4.29	3.94	4.18	4.10	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	48	4.80	887/1673	4.89	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	3	0	10	29	5	3.70	1275/1656	4.04	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.88
Lecture	1	0	^	4	0	1 77	0.0	4 00	1105/1506	4 25	4 25	4 42	4 20	4 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	4	9	17	29		1185/1586		4.35	4.43	4.37	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	4	14	38		1250/1585	4.46	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	11	20	22		1146/1582		3.99	4.26	4.17	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	6	9	9	30		1220/1575		4.03	4.27	4.17	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	10	5	7	12	9	3.12	1205/1380	3.69	3.76	3.94	3.78	3.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	8	4	12	16	15	3.47	1184/1520	3.58	3.47	4.01	3.76	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	5	12	13	22		1145/1515	3.93	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	5	13	13	20		1177/1511	3.79	3.88	4.27	4.00	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	22	0	3	11	6	11		614/ 994		3.82	3.94	3.73	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.31	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
5. Note official for grading made officer	3,5	Ü	Ü	Ü	o	_	O	1.00	, , ,				3.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced		0	0	0	_	-	0	4 00		de de de de	als als als als	4 00	2 00	ale ale ale ale
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59 59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35 ****/ 31	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	/ 31			4.34	3.88	

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 139

Anderson, Eric (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 1316 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	22	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)

139

Fall 2005

Page 1317 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies							Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	15	28		1171/1674		4.28	4.27	4.07	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	8	10	18	20	3.70	1401/1674	4.19	4.04	4.23	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	8	10	13	26	3.85	1131/1423	4.20	4.12	4.27	4.16	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	5	12	11	12	3.62	1405/1609	4.04	4.08	4.22	4.05	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	5	8	19	23	3.88	926/1585	3.97	3.80	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	3	8	8	16	3.89	1030/1535	4.11	4.04	4.08	3.89	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	7	17	27	3.98	1123/1651	4.29	3.94	4.18	4.10	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	48	4.80	887/1673	4.89	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	1	0	0	4	21	6	4.06	918/1656	4.04	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	3	13	15	4.39	1024/1586	4.35	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	1	5	7	17	4.33	1354/1585	4.46	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	808/1582	4.22	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	2	7	6	14	4.00	1138/1575	4.07	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	18	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	****/1380	3.69	3.76	3.94	3.78	3.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	8	4	12	16	15	3.47	1184/1520	3.58	3.47	4.01	3.76	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	5	12	13	22	3.89	1145/1515	3.93	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	5	13	13	20	3.83	1177/1511	3.79	3.88	4.27	4.00	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	22	0	3	11	6	11	3.81	614/ 994	3.95	3.82	3.94	3.73	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	****	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59 59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
	59 59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59 59	0	0	0	0		0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0	1 1		4.00	****/ 48	****	****			****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	U	U	U	U	Τ	0	4.00	49			4.27	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	***	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 139

KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1317 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 60 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	22	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0	HICCOLVED		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: Anderson, Eric (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 269 Questionnaires: 75

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1318 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	2	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain	new insights, skills from this co	urse	4	0	0	1	6	16	48	4.56	533/16	574	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.07	4.56
2. Did the instr	uctor make clear the expected go	als	5	0	0	0	7	23	40	4.47	625/16	574	4.47	4.04	4.23	4.16	4.47
Did the exam	questions reflect the expected g	goals	5	0	0	0	6	20	44	4.54	528/14	123	4.54	4.12	4.27	4.16	4.54
Did other eva	luations reflect the expected go	als	5	30	0	3	8	11	18	4.10	1029/16	509	4.10	4.08	4.22	4.05	4.10
Did assigned	readings contribute to what you	learned	5	0	0	2	17	14	37	4.23	584/15	85	4.23	3.80	3.96	3.88	4.23
	ssignments contribute to what yo	ou learned	6	29	0	1	4	11	24	4.45	454/15	35	4.45	4.04	4.08	3.89	4.45
	ng system clearly explained		4	0	0	1	13	15	42	4.38	700/16	551	4.38	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.38
-	s was class cancelled		5	2	0	0	0	7	61	4.90	,		4.90	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.90
9. How would you	grade the overall teaching effe	ctiveness	15	1	0	0	7	29	23	4.27	693/16	556	3.90	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.90
	Lecture		_	0	0	•	_	1.0	4.5	4 60	DE 2 / 1 F	- ^ -	4 25	4 25	4 42	4 25	4 25
	ructor's lectures well prepared		5	0	0	0	5	18	47	4.60	753/15		4.37	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.37
	uctor seem interested in the sub	-	4	0	0	0	2	11	58	4.79	853/15		4.38	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.38
	aterial presented and explained	_	5	0	0	1	9	16	44	4.47			4.17	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.17
	res contribute to what you learn		5	0	1	2	11	10	46	4.40			3.77	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.77
5. Did audiovisu	al techniques enhance your under	standing	5	11	4	1	19	15	20	3.78	887/13	380	3.78	3.76	3.94	3.78	3.78
	Discussion																
1 Did alaga dia	cussions contribute to what you	loarnod	20	0	7	5	18	13	12	2 22	1257/15	20	3.33	3.47	4.01	3.76	3.33
	ents actively encouraged to part		20	0	9	6	13	8	19		1341/15		3.40	3.47	4.24	3.70	3.40
		_		0	5	5		12	17								3.56
	uctor encourage fair and open di	scussion	20 19	45	1	5 1	16 2	2	1 / 5		1297/15		3.56 ****	3.88	4.27 3.94	4.00 3.73	****
4. were special	techniques successful		19	45	1	Т	2	2	5	3.82	***/ 5	194		3.82	3.94	3.73	
	Laboratory																
1. Did the lab i	ncrease understanding of the mat	erial	73	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 2	265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	****
	ided with adequate background in		74	0	0	0	1	0	0				****	3.69	4.19	3.97	****
	y materials available for lab ac		74	0	0	0	1	0	0				****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
	nstructor provide assistance	,01,10100	74	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 2		****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
	ents for lab reports clearly spe	cified	74	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 2		****	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
1	1 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1										,						
	Seminar																
1. Were assigned	topics relevant to the announce	ed theme	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 1	03	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
	Field Work																
 Did field exp 	erience contribute to what you l	.earned	74	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
	Self Paced																
_	d system contribute to what you		74	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/	61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
Did study que	stions make clear the expected g	goal	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
Were your con	tacts with the instructor helpfu	ıl	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedb	ack/tutoring by proctors helpful	-	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there en	ough proctors for all the studen	ıts	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
		Frequ	enas	, Diat	-rih:	1+ i o	n										
		rredo	terrey	DISC		1010	11										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expect	ed Grades				Re	ason	ເຮ				Тур	pe			Majors	3
00 27 1	0.00.00.00.1	21						 In d		າ				0			
00-27 1 28-55 12	0.00-0.99 1 A 1.00-1.99 0 B	21 32		кес	quire	eu I	or M	ıa JOY	5	2	Gradı	ia Le	=	U	Majo	ŊŢ	0
		32 12		Co.	oro ¹					0	11~A~-	~_~-	rad 7	E	Nor	mo i ox	75
				Ger	neral	L				U	Under	yı	Lau /	5	MOI1-	-major	75
84-150 10 3.00-3.49 14 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 24 F 0					at in	TO G				0	####		Moana +	horo s	vo not	ono	rh
Grad. 0	U		ът€	ectiv	/es				U	####	– r	Means t	тет.е 9	TE HOL	_ enoug	ìTT	

P 1

I 0 Other 63

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 75

BUNCH, ANDREW D (Instr. B)

269

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1319 JAN 21, 2006 Baltimore County Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

-				-										
			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	6	16	48	4.56	533/1674	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.07	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	7	23	40	4.47	625/1674	4.47	4.04	4.23	4.16	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	6	20	44	4.54	528/1423	4.54	4.12	4.27	4.16	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	30	0	3	8	11	18	4.10	1029/1609	4.10	4.08	4.22	4.05	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	17	14	37	4.23	584/1585	4.23	3.80	3.96	3.88	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	29	0	1	4	11	24	4.45	454/1535	4.45	4.04	4.08	3.89	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	13	15	42	4.38	700/1651	4.38	3.94	4.18	4.10	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	0	7	61	4.90	724/1673	4.90	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	0	3	0	13	15	5	3.53	1367/1656		3.87	4.07	3.96	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	45	0	1	1	3	13	12	4.13	1230/1586	4.37	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	45	0	1	2	6	9	12		1485/1585		4.50	4.69	4.60	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	46	0	1	1	8	10	9		1239/1582		3.99	4.26	4.17	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	45	1	3	5	9	9	3		1469/1575		4.03	4.27	4.17	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	46	23	3	0	2	1	0		****/1380		3.76	3.94	3.78	3.78
3. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	10	23	5	U	2	1	U	2.17	/ 1300	3.70	3.70	3.94	3.70	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	7	5	18	13	12		1257/1520		3.47	4.01	3.76	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	9	6	13	8	19		1341/1515		3.97	4.24	3.97	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	5	5	16	12	17		1297/1511		3.88	4.27	4.00	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	19	45	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	3.97	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	3.97	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	***	3.64	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	***	****	4.41	4.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	***	****	3.98	3.32	***
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced	7.4	0	1	^	0	^	0	1 00	4444 / 6 1		****	4 00	2 07	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 61 ****/ 52		~ ~ ~ × ×	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, 32			4.26	3.91	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,		****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
Frequ	uency	/ Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00.27 1 0.00.00 1 7 01						 					0			
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 21 28-55 12 1.00-1.99 0 B 32		Red	quire	eu I	OT. IV	ıa JOY	S	2	Graduat	C	U	Majo)T	0
		0	n o	1				0	IIn.d	~~d "	-	NT	mo = ===	75
		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rau /	'5	NOU-	-major	75
84-150 10 3.00-3.49 14 D 1		- 7						0	шшии -	Maari	la a se -			.la
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 24 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - :	means t	nere a	re not	enoug	m

P 1

I 0 Other 63

Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 16

Page 1320 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions							equer		s .	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	533/1674	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.56
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	689/1674	4.44	4.04	4.23	4.26	4.44
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.25
		ations reflect			0	9	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.08	4.22	4.23	4.14
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	715/1585	4.08	3.80	3.96	3.91	4.08
6. Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.04	4.08	4.03	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	231/1651	4.75	3.94	4.18	4.20	4.75
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	494/1673	4.94	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	794/1656	4.20	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.20
	Logturo																	
		Lectur																
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	371/1586		4.35	4.43	4.48	4.81
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.50	4.69	4.76	4.75
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear:					0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31		4.31	3.99	4.26		4.31
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50		4.50	4.03	4.27		4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	413/1380	4.36	3.76	3.94	4.03	4.36
			_															
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	1	2		1327/1520	3.13	3.47	4.01	4.03	3.13
		_	_	ed to participate	9	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	971/1515	4.14	3.97	4.24	4.28	4.14
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1177/1511	3.83	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.83
		a '																
1 17		Semina			1 -	0	^	^	0	^	1	F 00	****/ 103			4 41	4 07	
1. were as	ssignea t	opics relevant	to the	e announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	^^^^/ 103	* * * * *	^ ^ ^ ^	4.41	4.07	* * * *
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1											
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors			
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Per		ed fo	 or M	 a ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		13
28-55						1,00	1411	-u - () <u>.</u> 1•1	۱۰۲ م	_	J	Graduat	_		1.10	, <u>.</u>	13
	56-83 5 2.00-2.99 0 C 5					Ger	nera.	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	3
	34-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					001	u.	-				•	onacı g		. •	1,011		3
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enona	h
	-		-	P 0									respons					
				- 0							_	_	I COL OILD		911			

Other

14

0

1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHYS 305 0101 STELLAR ASTROPHYSICS HENRIKSEN, MARK

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

7

Page 1321 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Frequen							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1559/1674		4.04	4.23	4.21	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1346/1423	3.17	4.12	4.27	4.27	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1377/1609	3.67	4.08	4.22	4.27	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	1540/1585	2.60	3.80	3.96	3.95	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1240/1535	3.60	4.04	4.08	4.15	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1544/1651	3.17	3.94	4.18	4.16	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.82	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1494/1656	3.20	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1191/1586	4.20	4.35	4.43	4.42	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1142/1585	4.60	4.50	4.69	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1442/1582	3.40	3.99	4.26	4.26	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1402/1575	3.40	4.03	4.27	4.25	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.76	3.94	4.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.47	4.01	4.09	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 316 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 EXTRAGALACTIC ASTRO/CO Fall 2005

Instructor: GEORGANOPOULOS,

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1322

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.04	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1609	****	4.08	4.22	4.27	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.80	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.04	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	524/1651	4.50	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	522/1656	4.40	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1025/1582	4.17	3.99	4.26	4.26	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.03	4.27	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	103/1380	4.83	3.76	3.94	4.01	4.83

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

Course-Section: PHYS 321 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE MECHANICS Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005

KRAMER, IVAN Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 11

_				
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	naire

Page 1323

				Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		rom this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1036/1674	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.18
2. Did the instructo	J ,		0	0	0	2	4	4	1		1550/1674		4.04	4.23	4.21	3.36
3. Did the exam ques		1 0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3		1284/1423		4.12	4.27	4.27	3.45
4. Did other evaluat			0	4	1	0	1	4	1		1423/1609	3.57	4.08	4.22	4.27	3.57
5. Did assigned read		_	0	3	1	1	2	2	2		1311/1585		3.80	3.96	3.95	3.38
6. Did written assign	9	-	0	9	1	0	0	0	1		****/1535		4.04	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was the grading s		-	0	2	1	0	3	2	3		1377/1651	3.67	3.94	4.18	4.16	3.67
8. How many times wa			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you gra		aching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.56
1 3	3															
1. Were the instruct	Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					1	2	0	8	4.36	1044/1586	4.36	4.35	4.43	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructo	r seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture mater	ial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	1	1	6	2	1	3.09	1495/1582	3.09	3.99	4.26	4.26	3.09
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	2	3.18	1461/1575	3.18	4.03	4.27	4.25	3.18
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	****	3.76	3.94	4.01	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.32	****		
3. Did the instructo	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.34	****		
Freq					rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Tν	ne			Maiors		

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

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0101 University of Maryland Title OPTICS LABORATORY

SHIH, YANHUA

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1324

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 l															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls from	this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1469/1674	3.81	4.28	4.27	4.26	3.63
		ctor make clear			1	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1649/1674	3.04	4.04	4.23	4.21	2.71
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1268/1423	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.27	3.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1285/1609	4.11	4.08	4.22	4.27	3.80
				hat you learned	0	4	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1565/1585	2.88	3.80	3.96	3.95	2.25
				what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1295/1535	4.08	4.04	4.08	4.15	3.50
		g system clearly			0	0	0	1	0	4	3		1009/1651	3.50	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.13
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	3	5		1114/1673		4.82	4.69	4.68	4.63
				ning effectiveness	0	3	0	1	3	0			1494/1656		3.87		4.07	3.20
		Lecture	a															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	repared	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3 33	1510/1586	3.92	4.35	4.43	4.42	3.33
					5	0	1	0	1	0	1		1574/1585	3.20	4.50	4.69	4.66	3.00
	old the instructor seem interested in the subject Tas lecture material presented and explained clear old the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	0	1	_		1457/1582	3.17	3.99	4.26	4.26	3.33
					5 5	0	1	0	0	1	1		1423/1575	2.29	4.03	4.27	4.25	3.33
					5	1	1	0	0	0	_		1217/1380		3.76	3.94		3.00
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand							U	U	U	1	3.00	121//1300	3.00	3.76	3.94	4.01	3.00
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn																	
					7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.09	****
				l to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.34	****
		Labora	cory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding of	the material	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 265	4.67	3.98	4.23	4.26	5.00
2. Were ye	ou provid	ded with adequat	e backs	round information	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	241/ 278	2.96	3.69	4.19	4.24	3.50
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avail	lable fo	or lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	190/ 260	4.13	4.19	4.46	4.49	4.25
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provide	e assist	ance	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	179/ 259	3.99	3.90	4.33	4.33	4.14
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	150/ 233	3.64	3.64	4.20	4.18	4.00
	F							ution	ı									
Guadita B								Das					m				M	
credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	; · – – – –			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	;	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55																		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	βh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
	I 0					Otl	ner					7						
				3 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0102

Title OPTICS LABORATORY

Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1325 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	0	Λ	3	2	3	4 00	1196/1674	3 81	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	3		1547/1674		4.04	4.23	4.21	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423		4.12	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	614/1609	4.11	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	0	3		1223/1585	2.88	3.80	3.96	3.95	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	238/1535	4.08	4.04	4.08	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	1	2		1592/1651	3.50	3.94	4.18	4.16	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.82	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1474/1656		3.87	4.07	4.07	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	858/1586	3.92	4.35	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1559/1585	3.20	4.50	4.69	4.66	3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1504/1582	3.17	3.99	4.26	4.26	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	1575/1575	2.29	4.03	4.27	4.25	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1520		3.47	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1515		3.97	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.34	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	132/ 265	4.67	3.98	4.23	4.26	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	2	2	0		2.43	278/ 278	2.96		4.23	4.26	2.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1 1	1	0	1	0	2	1	4.00	215/ 260	4.13	3.69 4.19	4.19	4.49	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	215/ 260 212/ 259	3.99	3.90	4.46	4.49	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	Τ.	<u>ب</u>	Δ	3	3.29	212/ 239		3.64	4.33	4.33	3.29
J. Were requirements for rab reports creatry specified	1	U	4	J	4	U	3	3.49	210/ 233	5.04	3.04	4.20	4.10	3.43

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

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101 University of Maryland Page 1326 MODERN PHYSICS LAB Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: WU, EN-SHINN

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

													_	
				_	ncies				ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1075/1674	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1305/1674	3.86	4.04	4.23	4.21	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.80	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.04	4.08	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1414/1651	3.57	3.94	4.18	4.16	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	1015/1673	4.71	4.82	4.69	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	849/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.35	4.43	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.50	4.69	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	3.99	4.26	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.03	4.27	4.25	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 265	4.67	3.98	4.23	4.26	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	188/ 278	4.00	3.69	4.19	4.24	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	215/ 260	4.00	4.19	4.46	4.49	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	191/ 259	4.00	3.90	4.33	4.33	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	228/ 233	2.83	3.64	4.20	4.18	2.83
Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	5

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

Course-Section: PHYS 335 0101 University of Maryland PHYS/CHEM ATMOSPHERE Baltimore County SPARLING, LYNN

Page 1327 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

							Eν	201101	ncies			Tnat	tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u dain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.33
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	1		1284/1674	3.89	4.04	4.23	4.21	3.89
		uestions reflec		1 0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	648/1423	4.44	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.44
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.33
				what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	2		1149/1585	3.63	3.80	3.96	3.95	3.63
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.04	4.08	4.15	4.25
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	5	2	2		1377/1651	3.67	3.94	4.18	4.16	3.67
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	742/1673	4.89	4.82	4.69	4.68	4.89
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	757/1656	4.22	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.22
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1442/1586	3.67	4.35	4.43	4.42	3.67		
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.66	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1228/1582	3.89	3.99	4.26	4.26	3.89
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575	4.44	4.03	4.27	4.25	4.44
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	167/1380	4.71	3.76	3.94	4.01	4.71
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.09	****
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.32	****
		_	_	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.34	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	βh
Р 0												respons	es to k	s to be significant				
				I 0		Other					4							

Course-Section: PHYS 407 0101 University of Maryland Page 1328 Title JAN 21, 2006

ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY Baltimore County Fall 2005 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 13

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

					1				Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	. – – – – –															
1. Did y	you gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.75
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.04	4.23	4.31	4.50
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	922/1423	4.15	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.15
4. Did o	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	4.17	4.08	4.22	4.30	4.17
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.80	3.96	4.01	3.80
6. Did v	written as:	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	767/1535	4.17	4.04	4.08	4.18	4.17
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	484/1651	4.54	3.94	4.18	4.23	4.54
8. How n	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How v	would you	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	744/1656	4.23	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.23
1. Were	the instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	916/1586	4.46	4.35	4.43	4.46	4.46		
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.50	4.69	4.76	4.85
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1094/1582	4.08	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.08
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	742/1575	4.46	4.03	4.27	4.35	4.46
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	845/1380	3.83	3.76	3.94	4.04	3.83
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did o	class disc			what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.18	****
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1515		3.97	4.24	4.40	****
		-	_		12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1511		3.88	4.27	4.45	****
 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Were special techniques successful 						0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 994			3.94	4.19	****
	Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	в 8															

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 425 0101 University of Maryland Title

RELATIVISTIC PHYSICS Baltimore County

Instructor: NAJMI, AH Enrollment: 8

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

4. Were special techniques successful

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

Ouestionnaires: 5

Fall 2005

Page 1329 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Examination											
			Frequencies 1 2 3 4					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1576/1674	3.25	4.04	4.23	4.31	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.33	3.80	3.96	4.01	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1355/1535	3.33	4.04	4.08	4.18	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1610/1651	2.50	3.94	4.18	4.23	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	3.87	4.07	4.19	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.35	4.43	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.50	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1406/1582	3.50	3.99	4.26	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	958/1575	4.25	4.03	4.27	4.35	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.76	3.94	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.47	4.01	4.18	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

0

3 1 0

3 0

3

0

0

0

0

0 1 1 4.50 629/1515 4.50 3.97 4.24 4.40 4.50

0 1 1 4.50 642/1511 4.50 3.88 4.27 4.45 4.50

0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.82 3.94 4.19 ****

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

Course-Section: PHYS 430 0101

INTRODUCTION TO MATERI

Title Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1330 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4		578/1674	4.50	4.20	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3 -	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.08	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	482/1585	4.33	3.80	3.96	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.04	4.08	4.18	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	330/1651	4.67	3.94	4.18	4.23	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	n	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2		381/1656	4.50	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.50
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	O	-	-	1.50	301/1030	1.50	3.07	1.07	1.10	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.35	4.43	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.83	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.03	4.27	4.35	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	540/1380	4.20	3.76	3.94	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	3.47	4.01	4.18	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1253/1515	3.67	3.97	4.24	4.40	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.64	4.20	4.10	****

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

Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHYS 601 0101

13

QUANTUM MECHANICS

TAKACS, LASZLO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Page 1331 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	792/1674	4.38	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	956/1674		4.04	4.23	4.34	4.23
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	861/1423		4.12	4.27	4.28	4.23
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	1	1	7	3		1094/1609	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	360/1585		3.80	3.96	4.23	4.46
				o what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	373/1535		4.04	4.08	4.27	4.50
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	977/1651		3.94	4.18	4.32	4.15
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673		4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	,		3.87			4.00
J. 110W WO	Jaia you	ning circultychess	_	O	O	Ü	2	O	2	1.00	JJJ/ 1030	1.00	3.07	1.07	1.13	1.00		
		Lectur																
1. Were t	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.77
2. Did th	ne instru	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.50	4.69	4.79	4.69		
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1034/1582	4.15	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.15
4. Did th	was lecture material presented and explained clear. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	915/1575	4.31	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.31
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	923/1380	3.73	3.76	3.94	3.85	3.73
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	2	2	3 56	1149/1520	3 56	3.47	4.01	4.19	3.56
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5	2		1137/1515		3.97	4.24	4.47	3.90
				d open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	2	1		1139/1511	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.49	3.90
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	3	6	0	1	2	1			881/ 994				4.49	
4. Were S	special c	echniques succe	SSIUI		3	O	U	Т	2	Т	U	3.00	001/ 994	3.00	3.04	3.94	4.07	3.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 3			ani r	 ed f	or Ma			1	 Graduat		4	Majo		10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8		1000	quii.	cu I	OT 1410	בט כי	D	_	Graduat	_	1	ra je) <u>+</u>	10
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	-major	3
84-150						Gei	iici a	_				U	onder-9	Lau	J	11011-	ilia JUI	3
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		רם.	ecti [.]	170C				0	#### - :	Maana +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	4	3.30-4.00	_	P 0		Elt	CCLI	veb				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her				1	.0	respons	co LU L	e sign	ıııcal	10	
				. 0 T 0		OEI	ner.				Т	U						

Course-Section: PHYS 605 0101 University of Maryland Title MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1332

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	582/1674	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	483/1674	4.59	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	811/1423	4.29	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1048/1609	4.07	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1084/1585	3.71	3.80	3.96	4.23	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.04	4.08	4.27	4.43
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	3	1	7	6	3.94	1175/1651	3.94	3.94	4.18	4.32	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1434/1673	4.24	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	680/1656	4.29	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	354/1586	4.82	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1024/1585	4.71	4.50	4.69	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	380/1582	4.71	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	730/1575	4.47	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1196/1380	3.14	3.76	3.94	3.85	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	0	3	2	3.38	1234/1520	3.38	3.47	4.01	4.19	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	2	2		1233/1515	3.71	3.97	4.24	4.47	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	865/1511	4.29	3.88	4.27	4.49	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	****
-														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	11	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 606 0101 University of Maryland Page 1333
Title CLASSICAL MECHANICS Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: RUBIN, MORTON H Fall 2005
Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires:	5	Student Cours	se Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------------	---------------	---------------

I

?

0

1

	Questions						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.44	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674		4.04	4.23	4.34	4.80
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.60
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.60
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	265/1585	4.60	3.80	3.96	4.23	4.60
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.04	4.08	4.27	4.60
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.94	4.18	4.32	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.25	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.25
		T	_															
1 Were th	he instri	Lectur	_	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.80
	<u> </u>					0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.79	5.00
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	777/1582		3.99	4.26	4.33	4.40
	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575		4.03	4.27	4.30	4.80
				your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	0	1		1217/1380		3.76	3.94		3.00
		-	-	5														
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	986/1520		3.47	4.01	4.19	3.80
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	1		1180/1515	3.80	3.97	4.24	4.47	3.80
		_		nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2		1050/1511	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.49	4.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.82	3.94	4.07	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pos	sons	-			Ту	ne			Majors	
CTECTICS FO				Expedied Grades						- 				 be				, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	50 0 3.00-3.49 0 D																	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

3

University of Maryland Page 1334

Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	('Ollred	Fixa luation	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: PHYS 621 0101

4

ATMOS PHYSICS I

SPARLING, LYNN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

						Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questio	ons		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Gener	al															
1. Di	d you gair	new insights,sk	ills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Di	d the inst	ructor make clea	ar the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.50
3. Di	d the exar	n questions refle	ect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.75
4. Di	d other ev	aluations reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.33
5. Di	d assigned	d readings contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.80	3.96	4.23	4.00
6. Di	d written	assignments cont	ribute	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.04	4.08	4.27	4.33
7. Wa	s the grad	ding system clear	ly expl	ained	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1610/1651	2.50	3.94	4.18	4.32	2.50
8. Ho	w many tir	nes was class car	ncelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.50
9. Ho	w would yo	ou grade the over	all tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.00
		Lecti																
1. We	re the ins	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.50	5.00		
		ructor seem inte			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1585		4.50	4.69	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		632/1582		3.99	4.26	4.33	4.50
		ures contribute			0	0	0	0	0	1	3		359/1575		4.03	4.27	4.30	4.75
				your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	666/1380		3.76	3.94	3.85	4.00
		D.L.																
1 54			ssion		2	0	^	_	1	^	_	2 00	1252/1500	2 00	2 47	4 01	4 10	2 00
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	Ţ	0	0		1353/1520		3.47	4.01	4.19	3.00
		_	_	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	1024/1515		3.97	4.24	4.47	4.00
3. D1	a the inst	ructor encourage	e iair a	nd open discussion	3	U	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.88	4.27	4.49	5.00
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credi	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2																	1
00-2		A 2		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	r	1		
28-5		В 1				_									_			

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHYS 690 0101

13

PROF SKILLS PHYS

SUMMERS, GEOFFR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2005

Page 1335

JAN 21, 2006

Ctudent	College	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire

	Ouestions						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 D:	d man anim m	Genera new insights,ski	-	m this source	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.25
		iew insignis,ski ictor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	<i>5</i>	4		1026/1674	4.25	4.20	4.27	4.34	4.25
		questions reflec			0	9	0	0	1	2	0		1214/1423	3.67	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.67
		uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	3	5	4		1042/1609	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.34	4.08
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	2	5	4.00	708/1585	4.00	3.80	3.96	4.23	4.08
		_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	5 5	4.09	548/1535	4.09	4.04	4.08	4.23	4.09
		ng system clearl			٥	2	0	2	2	2	1		1289/1651		3.94	4.18	4.32	3.80
		s was class canc		ined	1	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1673		4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	693/1656			4.07		4.27
э. по	w would you	grade the overa	.II teat	ning effectiveness		U	U	U	U	0	3	4.27	093/1030	4.4/	3.07	4.07	4.13	4.4/
		Lectur	e															
1. We	re the instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1586	4.58	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.58		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.50	4.69	4.79	4.75
	Was lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	546/1582	4.58	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.58
						0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.50
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	859/1380	3.82	3.76	3.94		3.82
		Discus	sion															
1. Di	d class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1520	4.38	3.47	4.01	4.19	4.38
2. We	re all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	523/1515	4.63	3.97	4.24	4.47	4.63
3. Di	d the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1511	4.63	3.88	4.27	4.49	4.63
4. We	re special t	echniques succe	ssful		4	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	3.82	3.94	4.07	4.40
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credi	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
												- 						
	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 1					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	7	Majo	r	8
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																	
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	4
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 7 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					_						_						_
Grad	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h		
				P 10								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 707 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV ELECTROMAGNETIC TH Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005

Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1336

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1407/1674	3.75	4.28	4.27	4.44	3.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.00
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.08	4.22	4.34	3.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	4.75	3.80	3.96	4.23	4.75
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.04	4.08	4.27	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.25	3.94	4.18	4.32	4.25
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.33	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	orepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.25		
2. Did th	e instruc	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.50	4.69	4.79	4.75		
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.25	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.25
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.03	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.76	3.94	3.85	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.47	4.01	4.19	4.50
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515		3.97	4.24	4.47	5.00
		-	_	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1511		3.88	4.27	4.49	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
	_																	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	r	4
28-55																		
56-83							nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150																		
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
	P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt				
				I 0		Ot	her					4						
				3 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 721 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 ATMOS RADIATION

Instructor: ORAIOPOULOS, LA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1337

	Outabian a				Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1559/1674	3.33	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.33
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.00
4. Did other evaluat	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	3.80	3.96	4.23	3.50
6. Did written assig	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1355/1535	3.33	4.04	4.08	4.27	3.33
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	3.94	4.18	4.32	2.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.33
9. How would you gra	How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene			0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	3.87	4.07	4.15	3.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1300/1586	3.75	4.35	4.43	4.50	3.75
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1472/1585	4.00	4.50	4.69	4.79	4.00
3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1457/1582	3.17	3.99	4.26	4.33	3.17
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1538/1575	2.83	4.03	4.27	4.30	2.83
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1127/1380	3.33	3.76	3.94	3.85	3.33
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.47	4.01	4.19	3.00
2. Were all students	actively encourage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	3.97	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1308/1511	3.50	3.88	4.27	4.49	3.50
		iency	Dist	crib	ution	n										
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Tv	pe			Maiors		

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

Course-Section: PHYS 721 0101 University of Maryland Page 1338 Title ATMOS RADIATION Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

Fall 2005

3 Questionnaires: 3

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			equer	ncies	3		Instructor		Course Dept		ot UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1559/1674	3.33	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	3.80	3.96	4.23	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1355/1535	3.33	4.04	4.08	4.27	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	1636/1651	2.00	3.94	4.18	4.32	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	3.87	4.07	4.15	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1480/1586	3.75	4.35	4.43	4.50	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.00	4.50	4.69	4.79	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.17	3.99	4.26	4.33	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1487/1575	2.83	4.03	4.27	4.30	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1127/1380	3.33	3.76	3.94	3.85	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.47	4.01	4.19	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1515		3.97			5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	1	0	0	1		1308/1511		3.88	4.27	4.49	3.50
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribı	ıt i oı	n									
11044	01107	2100			-									

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