

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	4.06	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	3.90	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	4.64	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	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	474/1586	4.76	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	286/1582	4.77	3.99	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	4.36	406/1380	4.36	3.76	3.94	3.78	4.36	
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															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
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	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	4.12	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	760/1423	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	3.53	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	4.13	****/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	4.68	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	3.72	1267/1656	3.72	3.87	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	2.37	1485/1520	2.37	3.47	4.01	3.76	2.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	17	1	7	0	5	2.17	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	2.10	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	3.67	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	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	****/ 99	****	****	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	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	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	****/ 35	****	****	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: SIMON, JASON PK  
 Enrollment: 230  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1310  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	8	13	12	4	3.21	1595/1674	3.15	4.28	4.27	4.07	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	14	10	12	3.77	1364/1674	3.59	4.04	4.23	4.16	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	22	2	1	7	3	4	3.35	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	3.58	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	1	8	3.06	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	3.53	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	3.62	1398/1651	3.98	3.94	4.18	4.10	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	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	2.76	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	2.76	1465/1511	2.84	3.88	4.27	4.00	2.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	687/ 994	3.64	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	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	2.80	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	3.13	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	2.91	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	31	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	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	98	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	98	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
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	4.67	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 3	A 35	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 1	B 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 there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 82		
			? 3		

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	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	14	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	351/1651	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	4.17	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															
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	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	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	****	



Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: FRENCH, JOSEPHG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 87  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1313  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	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	14	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	351/1651	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	3.38	1427/1656	3.99	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1457/1586	4.30	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	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	3.25	1472/1582	3.98	3.99	4.26	4.17	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	****/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	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	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	****	

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: FRENCH, JOSEPHG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 87  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1313  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101  
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	27	57	4.53	570/1674	4.28	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	3.76	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	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	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	****	

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101  
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 27	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	18	1.00-1.99 3	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other 77	

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 134  
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1315  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	27	57	4.53	570/1674	4.28	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	42	2	0	0	15	30	2	3.72	1260/1656	4.04	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.19	
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	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	3.76	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	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.90	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	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	****	

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 134  
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1315  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 27	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	18	1.00-1.99 3	B 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other 77	

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: Anderson, Eric (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 139  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1316  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	4	9	17	29	4.20	1185/1586	4.35	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	4	14	38	4.47	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	3.98	1146/1582	4.22	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	6	9	9	30	3.90	1220/1575	4.07	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	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	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 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	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															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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	****	



Course-Section: PHYS 121 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: Anderson, Eric (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 139  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1316  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 139  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1317  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	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	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 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	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															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: KRAMER, ANNE W (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 139  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1317  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	15	1	0	0	7	29	23	4.27	693/1656	3.90	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	5	18	47	4.60	753/1586	4.37	4.35	4.43	4.37	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	11	58	4.79	853/1585	4.38	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	9	16	44	4.47	675/1582	4.17	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	11	10	46	4.40	819/1575	3.77	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	4	1	19	15	20	3.78	887/1380	3.78	3.76	3.94	3.78	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	7	5	18	13	12	3.33	1257/1520	3.33	3.47	4.01	3.76	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	9	6	13	8	19	3.40	1341/1515	3.40	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	5	5	16	12	17	3.56	1297/1511	3.56	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	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 21	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 32			
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	6	C 12	General 0	Under-grad 75	Non-major 75
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	14	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			

I	0	Other	63
?	0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	3.90	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	3.97	1485/1585	4.38	4.50	4.69	4.60	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	46	0	1	1	8	10	9	3.86	1239/1582	4.17	3.99	4.26	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	45	1	3	5	9	9	3	3.14	1469/1575	3.77	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	46	23	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	****/1380	3.78	3.76	3.94	3.78	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	7	5	18	13	12	3.33	1257/1520	3.33	3.47	4.01	3.76	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	9	6	13	8	19	3.40	1341/1515	3.40	3.97	4.24	3.97	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	5	5	16	12	17	3.56	1297/1511	3.56	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	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 32						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	6	C 12	General	0	Under-grad	75	Non-major	75
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	14	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 1						

I	0	Other	63
?	0		

Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1320  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	533/1674	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	689/1674	4.44	4.04	4.23	4.26	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.08	4.22	4.23	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	231/1651	4.75	3.94	4.18	4.20	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	494/1673	4.94	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	794/1656	4.20	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.35	4.43	4.48	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.50	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	871/1582	4.31	3.99	4.26	4.35	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.03	4.27	4.39	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	413/1380	4.36	3.76	3.94	4.03	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1327/1520	3.13	3.47	4.01	4.03	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1177/1511	3.83	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						



Course-Section: PHYS 305 0101  
 Title STELLAR ASTROPHYSICS  
 Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1321  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	3.33	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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.97	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.34	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 316 0101  
 Title EXTRAGALACTIC ASTRO/CO  
 Instructor: GEORGANOPOULOS,  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1322  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 321 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE MECHANICS  
 Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1323  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1036/1674	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	1	3.36	1550/1674	3.36	4.04	4.23	4.21	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1284/1423	3.45	4.12	4.27	4.27	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1423/1609	3.57	4.08	4.22	4.27	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1311/1585	3.38	3.80	3.96	3.95	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1535	****	4.04	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	3.94	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	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 grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	1044/1586	4.36	4.35	4.43	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor 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 material 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 techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	****	3.76	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0101  
 Title OPTICS LABORATORY  
 Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1324  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1469/1674	3.81	4.28	4.27	4.26	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1649/1674	3.04	4.04	4.23	4.21	2.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1268/1423	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.27	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1285/1609	4.11	4.08	4.22	4.27	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1565/1585	2.88	3.80	3.96	3.95	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1295/1535	4.08	4.04	4.08	4.15	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1009/1651	3.50	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1114/1673	4.81	4.82	4.69	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	3	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1494/1656	3.23	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1510/1586	3.92	4.35	4.43	4.42	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1574/1585	3.20	4.50	4.69	4.66	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1457/1582	3.17	3.99	4.26	4.26	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1423/1575	2.29	4.03	4.27	4.25	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.76	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding 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 you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	241/ 278	2.96	3.69	4.19	4.24	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for 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 lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	179/ 259	3.99	3.90	4.33	4.33	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	150/ 233	3.64	3.64	4.20	4.18	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	3.38	1547/1674	3.04	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	4.25	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	3.50	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	2.88	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	3.23	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	1.00	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/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	1	2.43	278/ 278	2.96	3.69	4.19	4.24	2.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.13	4.19	4.46	4.49	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	212/ 259	3.99	3.90	4.33	4.33	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	216/ 233	3.64	3.64	4.20	4.18	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101  
 Title MODERN PHYSICS LAB  
 Instructor: WU, EN-SHINN  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1326  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	2	3	2	3	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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 335 0101  
 Title PHYS/CHEM ATMOSPHERE  
 Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1327  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	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	0	2	6	1	3.89	1284/1674	3.89	4.04	4.23	4.21	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	648/1423	4.44	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.08	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1149/1585	3.63	3.80	3.96	3.95	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.04	4.08	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	3.94	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	742/1673	4.89	4.82	4.69	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	757/1656	4.22	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1442/1586	3.67	4.35	4.43	4.42	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	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	2	6	1	3.89	1228/1582	3.89	3.99	4.26	4.26	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	768/1575	4.44	4.03	4.27	4.25	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	167/1380	4.71	3.76	3.94	4.01	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 407 0101  
 Title ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY  
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1328  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.04	4.23	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	4.17	4.08	4.22	4.30	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	484/1651	4.54	3.94	4.18	4.23	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	744/1656	4.23	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	916/1586	4.46	4.35	4.43	4.46	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.50	4.69	4.76	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1094/1582	4.08	3.99	4.26	4.31	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	742/1575	4.46	4.03	4.27	4.35	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	845/1380	3.83	3.76	3.94	4.04	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	3.47	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	3.97	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	3.88	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PHYS 425 0101  
 Title RELATIVISTIC PHYSICS  
 Instructor: NAJMI, AH  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1329  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.97	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.50	3.88	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 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 not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHYS 430 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO MATERI  
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.04	4.23	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	4.27	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	0	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	4.50	381/1656	4.50	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.50	
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	5.00	****/ 265	****	3.98	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	3.69	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.19	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHYS 601 0101  
 Title QUANTUM MECHANICS  
 Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1331  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	792/1674	4.38	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	956/1674	4.23	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	861/1423	4.23	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	360/1585	4.46	3.80	3.96	4.23	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.04	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	977/1651	4.15	3.94	4.18	4.32	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1034/1582	4.15	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	915/1575	4.31	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	923/1380	3.73	3.76	3.94	3.85	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1149/1520	3.56	3.47	4.01	4.19	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1137/1515	3.90	3.97	4.24	4.47	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1139/1511	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.49	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.82	3.94	4.07	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 605 0101  
 Title MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS  
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1332  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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	
7. 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	3.71	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	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 606 0101  
 Title CLASSICAL MECHANICS  
 Instructor: RUBIN, MORTON H  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1333  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	265/1585	4.60	3.80	3.96	4.23	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.04	4.08	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.94	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.25	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	777/1582	4.40	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.76	3.94	3.85	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	986/1520	3.80	3.47	4.01	4.19	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1180/1515	3.80	3.97	4.24	4.47	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.82	3.94	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PHYS 621 0101  
 Title: ATMOS PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1334  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect 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. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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. Did written assignments contribute 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. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1610/1651	2.50	3.94	4.18	4.32	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.82	4.69	4.78	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.50	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.50	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.76	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.47	4.01	4.19	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.97	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.88	4.27	4.49	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 690 0101  
 Title PROF SKILLS PHYS  
 Instructor: SUMMERS, GEOFFR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1335  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1026/1674	4.17	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1214/1423	3.67	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1042/1609	4.08	4.08	4.22	4.34	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	708/1585	4.09	3.80	3.96	4.23	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	548/1535	4.36	4.04	4.08	4.27	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	3.94	4.18	4.32	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	693/1656	4.27	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1586	4.58	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.50	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	546/1582	4.58	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	859/1380	3.82	3.76	3.94	3.85	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	523/1515	4.63	3.97	4.24	4.47	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1511	4.63	3.88	4.27	4.49	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	3.82	3.94	4.07	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 707 0101  
 Title ADV ELECTROMAGNETIC TH  
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1336  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1407/1674	3.75	4.28	4.27	4.44	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.08	4.22	4.34	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.25	3.94	4.18	4.32	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.33	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.35	4.43	4.50	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.25	3.99	4.26	4.33	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.76	3.94	3.85	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	3.97	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.88	4.27	4.49	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PHYS 721 0101  
 Title: ATMOS RADIATION  
 Instructor: ORAIOPOULOS, LA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1337  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1300/1586	3.75	4.35	4.43	4.50	3.75	
2. Did the instructor 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 material 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 techniques 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 discussions 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 encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1308/1511	3.50	3.88	4.27	4.49	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 721 0101  
 Title: ATMOS RADIATION  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1338  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	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	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 encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1308/1511	3.50	3.88	4.27	4.49	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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