Course Section: PHYS 100 0101 University of Maryland

Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS SINSKY, JOEL

Instructor: Enrollment: 111 Questionnaires: 65

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 1317 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	5	19	36	4.48	633/1669	4.48	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	12	47	4.74	268/1666	4.74	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	9	52	4.82	203/1421	4.82	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	34	0	1	6	6	15	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	4	8	17	31	4.20	611/1555	4.20	3.88	4.00	3.92	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	43	0	4	1	4	8	3.94		3.94	4.24	4.06	3.86	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	9	49	4.71	260/1647	4.71	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	0	60	4.97	285/1668	4.97	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	16	35	4.65	249/1605	4.65	4.04	4.07	3.96	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	13	47	4.73	489/1514	1 72	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	61	4.73	103/1551	4.73	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	9	50	4.79	243/1503	4.79	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	55	4.87	200/1506	4.87	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	8	51	4.77	131/1311		3.98	3.85	3.68	4.77
J. Dia addiovistati teemiiques emanee your anderstanding	5	O	U	U	5	O	31	1.,,	131/1311	1. / /	3.70	3.03	3.00	1.,,
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	2	6	11	19	4.24	709/1490	4.24	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	2	9	27	4.66	495/1502	4.66	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	7	5	23	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	27	25	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	***	4.03	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
3 3														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced				_	_		_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***

Course Section: PHYS 100 0101 Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS Instructor:

SINSKY, JOEL

Enrollment: 111 Questionnaires: 65 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1317 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	65	Non-major	65
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Title BASIC PHYSICS I

Instructor: CUI, LILI

Enrollment: 211
Questionnaires: 110

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1318 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	2	5	9	29	57	4.31	840/1669	4.31	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	4	11	33	53	4.30	814/1666	4.30	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	4	12	32	54	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	29	1	5	8	31	27	4.08	981/1617	4.08	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	8	7	6	21	26	34	3.79	1037/1555	3.79	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	35	0	5	8	25	29	4.16	759/1543	4.16	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.16
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	8	0	1	1	10	34	56	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	0	8	93	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	4	3	18	35	30	3.93	1039/1605	3.93	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	3	23	74	4.68	553/1514	4.68	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	5	8	88	4.82	732/1551	4.82	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	4	13	34	46	4.13	996/1503	4.13	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	9	7	22	60	4.26	909/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	4	6	18	70	4.54	250/1311	4.54	3.98	3.85	3.68	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	85	0	4	3	3	6	9	3 52	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	85	0	1	2	6	6	10		****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	86	0	2	1	2	6	13		****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.07	****
4. Were special techniques successful	86	13	1	0	1	7	2		****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
1. Were apecial econniques adocessial	00	13	_	U	_	,		3.02	71000		3.01	1.00	3.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	6	3	13	26	18	3.71	175/ 226	3.71	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	2	3	8	26	27	4.11	139/ 233	4.11	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	3	3	12	20	28	4.02	186/ 225	4.02	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.02
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	12	2	5	19	29	3.76	187/ 223	3.76	4.30	4.35	4.19	3.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	2	5	13	21	25	3.94	131/ 206	3.94	4.03	4.15	4.01	3.94
Seminar				_										
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	108	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	108	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	108	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	108	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	108	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	109	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	109	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	109	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	108	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	108	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
1 Shots shough proceed for all the beaucits		J	0	J	-	_	J	5.50	, 20			1.51		

Course Section: PHYS 111 0101
Title BASIC PHYSICS I

Instructor: CUI, LILI

Enrollment: 211 Questionnaires: 110

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1318 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	Α	44	Required for Majors	4	Graduate 0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	29					
56-83	21	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	1	Under-grad 110	Non-major	110
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	16	D	1					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there	are not enoug	gh
				P	0			responses to be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	76			
				?	4					

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: CUI, LILI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 89 Questionnaires: 39 Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1319 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	11	22	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	23	4.45	634/1666	4.45	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	197/1421	4.84	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	465/1617	4.53	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	4	12	12	3.64	1155/1555	3.64	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	d 1	13	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	465/1543	4.44	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42	617/1647	4.42	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	428/1668	4.95		4.67	4.62	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes		1	0	0	4	16	13	4.27		3.69		4.07	3.96	3.69
, ,									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	34	4.87	257/1514	4.03	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	33	4.86	622/1551	4.52	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	16	18	4.38	753/1503	3.64	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	12	21	4.38	799/1506	3.40	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	5	31	4.76	142/1311		3.98		3.68	4.76
J. Did addiovibual eccumiques cumanee your anderstanding	_	_	_	O	O	5	31	1.70	112/1311	1.70	3.70	3.03	3.00	1.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	3	5	5		1013/1502	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	1	3	3		****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
			-	•	_	-	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	2	6	3	7	10	3.61	186/ 226	3.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.61
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	n 11	0	1	0	5	8	14	4.21	118/ 233	4.21	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	156/ 225	4.25	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	3	3	4	18	4.32	139/ 223	4.32	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.32
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	72/ 206		4.03	4.15		4.54
			-	_	_	_			,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	***	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: CUI, LILI (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1319 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: YOU, HAO (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 89

Questionnaires: 39

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1320 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	11	22	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	23	4.45	634/1666	4.45	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	197/1421	4.84	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	465/1617	4.53	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	4	12	12		1155/1555	3.64	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	465/1543	4.44	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42		4.42	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.85	4.67		4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	3	2	6	4	1	0	2.31	1576/1605	3.69	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	1	2	3	4	1		1440/1514	4.03	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	4	2	6		1371/1551	4.52	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	2	3	1	4	1		1436/1503	3.64	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	6	0	3	1	2	2.42	1468/1506	3.40	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	5	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	****/1311	4.76	3.98	3.85	3.68	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	3	5	5		1013/1502	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	2	6	3	7	10	3.61	186/ 226	3.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.61
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	5	8	14	4.21	118/ 233	4.21	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	156/ 225	4.25	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	3	3	4	18	4.32	139/ 223	4.32	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.32
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	72/ 206	4.54	4.03	4.15	4.01	4.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: YOU, HAO (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1320 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 89 Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

Title BASIC PHYSICS II Instructor: LINK, DANIEL (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 89 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1321

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	11	22	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	23	4.45	634/1666	4.45	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	197/1421	4.84	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	465/1617	4.53	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	4	12	12	3.64	1155/1555	3.64	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	465/1543	4.44	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42	617/1647	4.42	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	373/1605	3.69	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	1	1	7	4 67	****/1514	4.03	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	3	1	4		****/1551	4.52	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	2	2	5		****/1503	3.64	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	2	1	0	2		****/1506	3.40	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	4	2	0	0	0	1		****/1311			3.85	3.68	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	34	4	۷	U	U	U	Τ	2.33	***/1311	4.76	3.98	3.85	3.08	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	3	5	5		1013/1502	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	2	6	3	7	10	3.61	186/ 226	3.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.61
<u> </u>	11	0	1	0	5	8	14	4.21	118/ 233	4.21	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	2	-	7		4.21	- ,					4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11				4	-	15		156/ 225	4.25	4.36	4.50	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	3	3	4	18	4.32	139/ 223	4.32	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.32
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	72/ 206	4.54	4.03	4.15	4.01	4.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
5. Fix conferences help you carry out rich accivities	30	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	-	3.00	, 50			1.33	1.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: LINK, DANIEL (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 89
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1321 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor:

ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1322 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 238 Questionnaires: 95

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	N	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Didi	General		7	0	0	1	1.0	20	4.2	4 00	076/1660	4 00	4 40	4 22	4 00	4 00
	new insights, skills from this course		7 6	0	0	2	16 10	28 33	43 44	4.28	876/1669 777/1666		4.48	4.23	4.02 4.11	4.28
	ructor make clear the expected goals		7	0	0	3	10	22		4.42	657/1421		4.56	4.19		4.42
	questions reflect the expected goals					5			53						4.11	4.13
	aluations reflect the expected goals readings contribute to what you learne	~ d	8 6	40 5	1 3	5 6	4 20	14 25	23 30	4.13	946/1617 971/1555		4.35	4.15	3.99 3.92	3.87
_	assignments contribute to what you learned		7	5 57	0	2	20 7	25 7	15	4.13	807/1543		4.24	4.06	3.86	4.13
	ing system clearly explained	rneu	8	0	1	1	10	28	47	4.13	713/1647		4.25	4.12	4.06	4.13
_	es was class cancelled		8	5	0	0	0	0	82	5.00	1/1668		4.85	4.12	4.62	
	grade the overall teaching effectiver	ness 1	14	2	0	2	14	43	20	4.03	904/1605		4.04	4.07	3.96	3.92
	Lecture															
1 Were the inst	tructor's lectures well prepared		8	0	0	1	3	23	60	4.63	631/1514	4.63	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.63
	ructor seem interested in the subject		7	0	0	0	2	15	71	4.78	825/1551		4.76	4.66	4.55	4.78
	material presented and explained clear	l v	7	0	1	1	7	28	51	4.44	653/1503		4.15	4.24	4.17	4.44
	ares contribute to what you learned	± y	7	2	0	2	7	21	56	4.52			4.22	4.26	4.17	
	ual techniques enhance your understand	ina	7	9	3	6	9	32	29	3.99	609/1311		3.98	3.85	3.68	3.99
o. Did addiovist	dar techniques enhance your understand	1119	,	9	3	O	9	34	23	3.99	009/1311	3.99	3.90	3.03	3.00	3.33
1 Did -1 di	Discussion	1 م	1 4	0	0	7	1 /	10	2.4	2 70	1000/1400	2 70	2 00	4 05	2 05	3.78
	scussions contribute to what you learned		14	0	8		14	18	34		1022/1490		3.88	4.05	3.85	
	dents actively encouraged to participat		14	0	5	5	12	16	43	4.07	986/1502		4.32	4.26	4.06	4.07
	ructor encourage fair and open discussi		21	0	3	5	15	19	32		1064/1489		4.25	4.29	4.07	3.97
4. Were special	techniques successful	1	16	20	3	4	12	11	29	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.00
	Laboratory	_		_	_	_			_							
	increase understanding of the material		39	3	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 226		4.00	4.20	3.98	****
	vided with adequate background informat		91	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****
	ry materials available for lab activiti		90	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.42	****
	instructor provide assistance		91	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirer	ments for lab reports clearly specified	d 9	91	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	***	4.03	4.15	4.01	****
	Seminar															
l. Were assigned	d topics relevant to the announced ther	me 9	91	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
	Field Work															
l. Did field exp	perience contribute to what you learned	d 9	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
	Self Paced															
l. Did self-pace	ed system contribute to what you learne	ed 9	92	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study que	estions make clear the expected goal	9	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	***
3. Were your con	ntacts with the instructor helpful	9	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	***
_	pack/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there en	nough proctors for all the students	9	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
	I	Frequen	псу	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Gra	ades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 13	0.00-0.99 4 A 20				 quire					 5	 Graduat			Majo		4
28-55 21	1.00-1.99 4 A 20 1.00-1.99 0 B 31			re(	1ull.	u L	OT M	ajor	۵	J	Graduat	C	J	ria JC	) <u> </u>	4
56-83 10	2.00-2.99 3 C 22			Cor	neral	ı				1	Under-g	rad 0	95	Non	-major	91
84-150 2	3.00-3.49 8 D 3			Gel	.тст а.	_				_	onder-9	iau 3	, ,	11011-	ilia JOI	クエ
				F. T. G.	a+ i-					1	####	Moana +	horo -	.xo xo+	ono	rh
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 23 F 2			т⊥€	ectiv	/es				т	#### -				_	lTT

I 0 Other 72 ? 2

11115 121 0101

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: BUCZKOWS

BUCZKOWSKI, STE (Instr. C) Fall 2

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1323 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Non-major 91

Enrollment: 238
Questionnaires: 95

56-83

Grad.

84-150

10

2

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 23

3

8

C 22

D

F

Ρ

3

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	encie 3	es 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Se Me
	General															
l. Did you gain :	new insights,skills	from this course	7	0	0	1	16	28	43	4.28	876/1669	4.28	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.
	uctor make clear the		6	0	0	2	10	33	44	4.34	777/1666	4.34	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.
	questions reflect the		7	0	0	3	10	22	53	4.42		4.42	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.
	luations reflect the		8	40	1	5	4	14	23	4.13			4.35	4.15	3.99	4.
_	readings contribute t	-	6	5	3	6	20	25	30	3.87				4.00	3.92	3.
	_	e to what you learned	7	57	0	2	7	7	15	4.13	807/1543		4.24	4.06		4.
_	ng system clearly exp	•	8	0 5	1	1	10	28 0	47	4.37	713/1647		4.25	4.12	4.06	4.
_	s was class cancelled		8 69	11	2	2	4	6	82 1	5.00	1/1668		4.85	4.67	4.62	5.
. How would you	grade the overall to	eaching effectiveness	69	11	۷	2	4	ь	1	3.13	****/1605	3.92	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.
	Lecture						_	_	_							
	ructor's lectures we		86	0	1	1	1	3	3		****/1514		4.57	4.39		4.
	uctor seem interested	_	84	0	1	0	3	0	7		****/1551		4.76	4.66		4.
	aterial presented and		86	0	0	2	1	2	4		****/1503		4.15	4.24		4.
	res contribute to wha		86	0	2	0	2	2	3		****/1506		4.22	4.26	4.17	
Did audiovisu	al techniques enhance	e your understanding	85	6	Ü	0	Τ	2	1	4.00	****/1311	3.99	3.98	3.85	3.68	3
	Discussion		7.4	0	0	_	7.4	1.0	2.4	2 50	1000/1400	2 50	2 00	4 05	2 05	2
	cussions contribute	-	14	0	8	7	14	18	34		1022/1490		3.88	4.05	3.85	3
	ents actively encoura		14	0	5	5	12	16	43	4.07	986/1502		4.32	4.26	4.06	4
	uctor encourage fair	_	21 16	0 20	3	5 4	15 12	19 11	32 29	4.00	1064/1489		4.25	4.29	4.07	
were special	techniques successful	L	10	20	3	4	12	ТТ	29	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.81	4
511.1 7.1	Laboratory	6 . 1	0.0	2	0	0		0	-	4 22	***** / 006	de de de de	4 00	4 00	2 00	*
	ncrease understanding		89	3	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	*
	_	ackground information	91	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	*
	y materials available nstructor provide ass		90 91	4 2	0	0	0	0	1 2		****/ 225 ****/ 223	****	4.36	4.50	4.42 4.19	*
	ents for lab reports		91	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	4.30 4.03	4.35	4.19	*
	Seminar															
Were assigned	topics relevant to	the announced theme	91	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	*
	Field Work															
Did field exp	erience contribute to	o what you learned	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	*
	Self Paceo	3														
Did self-pace	d system contribute		92	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	*
_	stions make clear the	_	92	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	*
	tacts with the instru		92	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46		5.00	4.45	4.26	*
	ack/tutoring by proct		92	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 33		****	4.25	4.25	*
	ough proctors for all	_	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	*
		Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	on									
edits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	easor	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	5
0-27 13	0.00-0.99 4	A 20		Re	 guir	ed f	or M	aior	 s	5	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
8-55 21	1.00-1.99 0	В 31			=			- 5						5 -		
		-														

General

Electives

1

1

Under-grad 95

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

I 0 Other 72 ? 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: BOLE, TIM (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 238

Questionnaires: 95

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1324 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
***************************************														
General	_			_					0551550					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	1	16	28	43	4.28	876/1669	4.28	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	10	33	44	4.34	777/1666	4.34	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	3	10	22	53	4.42	657/1421	4.42	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	40	1	5	4	14	23	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	3	6	20	25	30	3.87	971/1555	3.87	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	57	0	2	7	7	15	4.13	807/1543	4.13	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	1	10 0	28	47	4.37	713/1647	4.37	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8 63	5 8	0 1	0	8	0 9	82 6	5.00 3.79	1/1668 1179/1605	5.00 3.92	4.85 4.04	4.67 4.07	4.62 3.96	5.00 3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	78	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	****/1514	4.63	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	76	0	1	0	3	1	14	4.42	****/1551	4.78	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	79	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	****/1503	4.44	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	79	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	****/1506	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	79	8	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1311	3.99	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.99
Discussion		_	_	_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	8	7	14	18	34		1022/1490	3.78	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	5	5	12	16	43	4.07	986/1502	4.07	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	5	15	19	32		1064/1489	3.97	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	16	20	3	4	12	11	29	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	3	0	0	0	2	1	1 22	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	90	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	91	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	4.03	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	91	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 13 0.00-0.99 4 A 20		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55 21 1.00-1.99 0 B 31 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 3 C 22		Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 9	95	Non-	major	91
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 8 D 3 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 23 F 2			ecti					1	#### - 1					

I 0 Other 72 ? 2

Course Section: PHYS 121H 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1325

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	ANDERSON,	ERIC	(Instr. A		Fa	all 2006	
Enrollment:	9						
Ouestionnaires:	8			Student	Course E	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

								Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	1																
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	n this cou	rse	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.2
2. Did the	instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.7
3. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	spected go	als	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.8
4. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goa	ls	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.0
5. Did ass	igned re	eadings contrib	ute to w	vhat you l	earned	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.92	4.0
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you	learned	2	2	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1530/1543	2.25	4.24	4.06	3.86	2.2
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y explai	ined		0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.5
8. How man	y times	was class cand	elled			0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.8
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effec	tiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	918/1605	3.70	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.7
		Lectur	_																
		uctor's lecture				0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	647/1514		4.57	4.39	4.32	4.5
		ctor seem inter				0	0	0	1	0	1	6		1193/1551		4.76	4.66	4.55	4.7
		terial presente				0	0	0	1	0	5	2		1066/1503		4.15	4.24	4.17	3.3
		es contribute t	-			0	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1189/1506		4.22	4.26	4.17	3.5
5. Did aud	liovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	our unders	tanding	1	2	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.8
		Discus																	
		ussions contrib		-		0	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1265/1490		3.88	4.05	3.85	3.2
		nts actively en				0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	522/1502		4.32	4.26	4.06	4.6
		ctor encourage		d open dis	cussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	434/1489		4.25	4.29	4.07	4.7
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful			0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.5
		Labora	-																
		crease understa				7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	***
		ded with adequa			ormation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	***
4. Did the	lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance		7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	***
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4												_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0		Ger	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									3				-	
01 130	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh
Grad.	0			ъ	0									respons	es to h	ne siar	ificar	~ ۱+	
	O			P	U									TCDPOILD	CB CO L	JC BIGI	LI I I Cai	1 C	
	Ü			P I	0		Otl	her					5	respons	CB CO L	oc bigi.	illicai	10	

Course Section: PHYS 121H 0101 Title INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS Instructor:

Enrollment:

9

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 1326 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029 TAKACS, LASZLO (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 8	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.25
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.75
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.88
4. Did otl	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	2	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1530/1543	2.25	4.24	4.06	3.86	2.25
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.86
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1400/1605	3.70	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.70
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture	_	-	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	923/1514	4.53	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.53
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.75	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.75
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	2	0	0	4	1	0	1	2.67	1458/1503	3.33	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.33
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	1	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1371/1506	3.58	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.58
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1311	3.80	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1265/1490	3.25	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.25
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	522/1502	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.63
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.50
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	rease understa	nding of	the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backs	round information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3					or Ma			1	Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		Kec	4utt (	eu I	OT MG	LJOES		_	Graduat	C	U	Majc	, <u> </u>	3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cor	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Gei	ici d	_				U	onder -g	Lau	O	NOII-	iia jui	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	Б 0 F 0		בום	ecti	17AC				2	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
grau.	U	3.30-4.00	T	P 0		17.7	LULI	v C D				4	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	ner					5	T CPFOILE	CD LO L	c argi	ııııcaı		
				? 1		OLI	161					J						
				t T														

Course Section: PHYS 122 0101 University of Maryland

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County

ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 217 Ouestionnaires: 94

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 4 12 22 55 4.38 769/1669 4.38 4.48 4.23 4.02 4.38 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 1 10 26 55 4.43 648/1666 4.43 4.36 4.19 4.11 4.43 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 9 25 57 4.46 607/1421 4.46 4.56 4.24 4.11 4.46 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 29 2 6 12 10 32 4.03 1011/1617 4.03 4.35 4.15 3.99 4.03 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 7 7 4 12 30 29 3.85 980/1555 3.85 3.88 4.00 3.92 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 38 2 4 11 16 19 3.88 1035/1543 3.88 4.24 4.06 3.86 3.88 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 1 7 24 60 4.55 424/1647 4.55 4.25 4.12 4.06 4.55 5 1 1 0 0 0 87 4.95 357/1668 4.95 4.85 4.67 4.62 4.95 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 0 0 1 8 36 31 4.28 666/1605 3.90 4.04 4.07 3.96 3.90 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 7 19 65 4.64 631/1514 4.64 4.57 4.39 4.32 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 4 14 72 4.71 954/1551 4.71 4.76 4.66 4.55 4.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 3 8 23 56 4.47 621/1503 4.47 4.15 4.24 4.17 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 2 7 20 60 4.55 594/1506 4.55 4.22 4.26 4.17 4.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 3 6 3 14 22 35 3.96 631/1311 3.96 3.98 3.85 3.68 3.96 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 13 5 15 19 22 3.43 1196/1490 3.43 3.88 4.05 3.85 3.43 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 10 8 19 17 20 3.39 1340/1502 3.39 4.32 4.26 4.06 3.39 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0 13 5 11 20 19 3.40 1321/1489 3.40 4.25 4.29 4.07 3.40 4. Were special techniques successful 25 34 1 3 8 7 16 3.97 517/1006 3.97 3.84 4.00 3.81 3.97 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.50 4.34 4.17 **** 93 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 93 0 0 93 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.45 4.26 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 93 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 93 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 29 **** *** 4.34 4.22 ****

Page 1327

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	39	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	22	1.00-1.99	0	В	37						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	10	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	94	Non-major	90
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	23	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	84	-		_	
				2	2						

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: BUNCH, ANDREW (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 217 Questionnaires: 94

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1328 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	 al															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,sk:	ills fro	m this course	1	0	0	4	12	22	55	4.38	769/1669	4.38	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.3
. Did the	instru	ctor make clear	r the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	1	10	26	55	4.43	648/1666	4.43	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.4
B. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the e	xpected goals	1	0	1	1	9	25	57	4.46	607/1421	4.46	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.4
. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect	t the ex	pected goals	3	29	2	6	12	10	32	4.03	1011/1617	4.03	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.0
. Did ass	igned re	eadings contrib	bute to	what you learned	5	7	7	4	12	30	29	3.85	980/1555	3.85	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.8
. Did wri	tten ass	signments conti	ribute t	o what you learned	4	38	2	4	11	16	19	3.88	1035/1543	3.88	4.24	4.06	3.86	3.8
		g system clear:			2	0	0	1	7	24	60	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.5
		was class cand			5	1	1	0	0	0	87		357/1668		4.85	4.67	4.62	4.9
	-			hing effectiveness	61	8	0	1	13	8	3		1348/1605		4.04	4.07	3.96	3.9
		Lectu	re															
. Were th	e instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	79	0	1	1	7	1	5	3.53	****/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.6
. Did the	instru	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	80	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	****/1551	4.71	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.7
. Was lec	ture mat	terial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	80	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	****/1503	4.47	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.4
		es contribute 1			81	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	****/1506	4.55		4.26	4.17	4.5
				our understanding	81	8	0	1	0	1	3		****/1311		3.98	3.85	3.68	3.9
. 214 444	1011000	-	-	our unacrocunaring	01	Ū	Ü	-	Ü	_		1.20	, 1311	3.70	3.70	3.03	3.00	J.,
		Discus																
				what you learned	20	0	13	5	15	19	22		1196/1490		3.88	4.05	3.85	3.4
		_	_	d to participate	20	0	10	8	19	17	20		1340/1502		4.32	4.26	4.06	3.3
		_		d open discussion	26	0	13	5	11	20	19		1321/1489		4.25	4.29	4.07	3.4
. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	essful		25	34	1	3	8	7	16	3.97	517/1006	3.97	3.84	4.00	3.81	3.9
			Paced															
				what you learned	93	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 55		4.50		4.17	* * *
		tions make clea			93	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42		5.00	4.31	4.08	* * *
		acts with the :			93	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 46		5.00	4.45	4.26	***
		ck/tutoring by	_	_	93	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 33		****	4.25	4.25	**
. Were th	ere enou	ugh proctors fo	or all t	he students	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	* * *
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 3	0.00-0.99	 1	 A 39		 Re	quir	ed f	or M	 a i ი r	 :s	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 4
28-55	22	1.00-1.99	0	В 37										-	-	) -		
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	10	C 9		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 9	94	Non-	-major	9(
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	23	D 1								-			-			- (
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ah
	ŭ	3.33 1.00		P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		0.1	her				_	34	T CPPOIIP		oc bigi	ıııcaı		

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L

Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 1329 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Overtiens	MD	377		equer			_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	меап	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	7	7	3.95	1230/1669	3.95	4.48	4.23	4.02	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1421	****	4.56	4.24	4.11	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	6	4	2	2.89	1472/1555	2.89	3.88	4.00	3.92	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	458/1647	4.52	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	14	1	3.84	1140/1605	3.84	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	13		1111/1551	4.60	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	1	12	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	4	8	3.75	1243/1506	3.75	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	919/1311	3.55	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	1	1	2 83	1391/1490	2.83	3.88	4.05	3.85	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	1	2		1357/1502	3.33	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	1	1		1379/1489	3.17	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	3		****/1006	***	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
	2	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.61	62/ 226	4.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	4.61
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.61	66/ 233	4.61	4.00	4.20	4.09	4.61
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.67	68/ 225	4.67	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	65/ 223	4.03	4.30	4.35	4.42	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	U T	2	T	12	4.78	76/ 206	4.78	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.78
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	3	U	U	U	3	3	12	4.50	70/ 200	4.50	4.03	4.15	4.01	4.30

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	0						

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

GEORGE, IAN

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1330

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean			
	_	Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57			4.48	4.23	4.34	4.57
		ctor make clear		_	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	715/1666		4.36	4.19	4.29	4.38
	_	uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	,		4.56	4.24	4.35	4.62
		uations reflect			0	7	0	0	3	8	3		1029/1617		4.35	4.15	4.24	4.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	2	12	4.25	558/1555		3.88	4.00	3.96	4.25
		_		o what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	5	5		552/1543		4.24	4.06	4.10	4.36
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	1	5	9	6		1102/1647		4.25	4.12	4.19	3.95
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	19	2		1482/1668		4.85	4.67	4.59	4.10
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	851/1605	4.11	4.04	4.07	4.15	4.11
		Lectur	٩															
1 Were th	he instri	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	9	4 24	1094/1514	4 24	4.57	4.39	4.39	4.24
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0		14		1028/1551			4.66	4.72	4.67
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	-	4	7	9		978/1503		4.15	4.24	4.29	4.14
		es contribute to			0	0	0	1	2		12		789/1506			4.26	4.33	
				our understanding	1	-	1	0	4	5			665/1311			3.85	3.96	
		Discus																
				what you learned	17		0	0	2	1	1		****/1490		3.88	4.05	4.11	****
		_	_	d to participate	17	-	0	1	1	-	2		****/1502		4.32	4.26	4.31	****
				d open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1489		4.25	4.29	4.36	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		16	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.99	****
				Frequ	ıency	, Dist	trib	ation	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	ason	a			Ty	20			Majors	
										ь 								· 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Gei	nera	l				4	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1					ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.4						

Course Section: PHYS 303 0101 University of Maryland
Title THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH Baltimore County

Title THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH
Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1331

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	489/1669	4.59	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	691/1666	4.41	4.36	4.19	4.20	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	475/1421	4.59	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	747/1555	4.05	3.88	4.00	4.03	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.24	4.06	4.14	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	713/1647	4.36	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	320/1605	4.58	4.04	4.07	4.09	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	189/1514	4.91	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	637/1503	4.45	4.15	4.24	4.28	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	770/1506	4.41	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1311	****	3.98	3.85	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	Ο	2	3	1	3 43	1202/1490	3.43	3.88	4.05	4.11	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	729/1502	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.28	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.35	4.29
Frem	enas	Diet	-rihı	1 <b>t</b> i 01	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				2	Λ						

Course Section: PHYS 316 0101 University of Maryland

Title EXTRAGALACTIC ASTRO/CO Baltimore County Instructor: BECKMANN, VOLKE Fall 2006

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1332

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1028/1666	4.11	4.36	4.19	4.20	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	665/1555	4.14	3.88	4.00	4.03	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1035/1543	3.89	4.24	4.06	4.14	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1382/1605	3.44	4.04	4.07	4.09	3.44
T a mb														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	2	1	_	1 11	000/1514	1 11	4 57	4.39	4.46	4.44
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2 0	1		4.44	892/1514	4.44				
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	4	4	5		1152/1551	4.56	4.76	4.66	4.70 4.28	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	-	-	T	J	_	2	J		1415/1503	3.11	4.15	4.24		3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	2		1309/1506	3.56	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	Т	Τ	0	0	4	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.98	3.85	3.97	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.35	****
									, ,					

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

Course Section: PHYS 330L 0101 Title OPTICS LABORATORY

University of Maryland Baltimore County Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B Fall 2006

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1333 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	256/1669	4.76	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	425/1666		4.36	4.19	4.20	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	0	0	1		****/1421		4.56	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	358/1617		4.35	4.15	4.22	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	10	4	3.94	872/1555		3.88	4.00	4.03	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	465/1543		4.24	4.06	4.14	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	2	10		1205/1647	3.86	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668		4.85	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	268/1605		4.04	4.07	4.09	4.63
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	O	U	U	U	,	12	1.05	200/1003	1.05	1.01	1.07	1.05	1.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551	4.95	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.15	4.24	4.28	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	884/1506	4.29	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	333/1311	4.40	3.98	3.85	3.97	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	3	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.88	4.00	4.20	4.17	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	38/ 233	4.85	4.37	4.19	4.13	4.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	54/ 225	4.90	4.36	4.50	4.45	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	42/ 223	4.90	4.30	4.35	4.27	4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	2	2	5	9	3.85	144/ 206	3.85	4.03	4.15	4.08	3.85
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	21	-			
				2	0						

Course Section: PHYS 331L 0101 University of Maryland MODERN PHYSICS LAB Baltimore County

Title Instructor: WU, EN-SHINN Fall 2006

Enrollment: 10 Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1334

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 2 6 1 3.70 1391/1669 3.70 4.48 4.23 4.28 3.70 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 0 4 4 0 3.00 1578/1666 3.00 4.36 4.19 4.20 3.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1421 **** 4.56 4.24 4.25 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 3 2 3.60 1334/1617 3.60 4.35 4.15 4.22 3.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 2 3 2 3.44 1272/1555 3.44 3.88 4.00 4.03 3.44 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 2 4 1 3.63 1215/1543 3.63 4.24 4.06 4.14 3.63 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 3 3 1 1 2.60 1582/1647 2.60 4.25 4.12 4.14 2.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 901/1668 4.80 4.85 4.67 4.68 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 4 4 1 3.67 1274/1605 3.67 4.04 4.07 4.09 3.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 6 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 1324/1514 3.75 4.57 4.39 4.46 3.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 1 1 1 3.50 1489/1551 3.50 4.76 4.66 4.70 3.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 1 0 2 0 1 3.00 1423/1503 3.00 4.15 4.24 4.28 3.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 1 2 1 0 2.60 1447/1506 2.60 4.22 4.26 4.30 2.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 4 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1311 **** 3.98 3.85 3.97 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1490 **** 3.88 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1502 **** 4.32 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/1489 **** 4.25 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 7 2 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1006 **** 3.84 4.00 4.10 **** Laboratory 0 ( 2.2

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	140/ 226	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.17	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	117/ 233	4.22	4.37	4.19	4.13	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	187/ 225	4.00	4.36	4.50	4.45	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	193/ 223	3.67	4.30	4.35	4.27	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	3	1	4	1	0	2.33	203/ 206	2.33	4.03	4.15	4.08	2.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6	1					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

#### Course Section: PHYS 407 0101 University of Maryland Page 1335 Title ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Fall 2006

Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies		_		ructor		e Dept			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	a gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	734/1669	4.40	4.48	4.23	4.39	4.40
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	868/1666	4.27	4.36	4.19	4.22	4.27
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	607/1421	4.47	4.56	4.24	4.38	4.47
4. Did oth	ner eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.63
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	665/1555	4.14	3.88	4.00	4.08	4.14
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	453/1543	4.45	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.45
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	864/1605	4.08	4.04	4.07	4.16	4.08
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1357/1514	3.64	4.57	4.39	4.45	3.64	
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	1223/1551	4.47	4.76	4.66	4.73	4.47	
				explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	8	2	3.71	1255/1503	3.71		4.24	4.27	3.71
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	7	3.80	1225/1506	3.80	4.22	4.26	4.29	3.80
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	12	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	****	3.98	3.85	3.88	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	4.26	****
		-	_	ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.52	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00 07															1			12
	00-27						quir	ea I	or Ma	a Jor	S	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or.	13
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 3							1				0	TTm d our		. 4	Mari		2
	4-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 1						nera	Т				0	Under-g	rau l	L <b>4</b>	Non-	major	2
84-150 Grad.								ves				0	#### - 1	Moona +	horo a	ro not	onous	rh
Grau.	Т	3.50-4.00	,	P 0		E16	ECLI	ves				U	respons				_	ìTT
				I 0		O+1	her				1	5			3-		-	

? 1

Course Section: PHYS 601 0101 University of Maryland Title QUANTUM MECHANICS

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

FRANSON, JAMES

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1336

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
G														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	331/1421	4.71	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	461/1555	4.38	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647		4.25	4.12	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	810/1605	4.14	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.14
Lecture	0	0	0	0	^	1	7	4 00	040/1514	4 00	4 57	4 20	4 27	4.88
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	7 7	4.88	240/1514 594/1551	4.88 4.88	4.57 4.76	4.39 4.66	4.37 4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.76	4.24	4.72	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1506	4.63	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	0	1		3.86	731/1311		3.98	3.85		3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	Τ.	1	1	U	Т	4	3.00	/31/1311	3.00	3.90	3.05	3.09	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	841/1006	3.33	3.84	4.00	4.11	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 233	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.41	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	4.03	4.15	4.39	****
Seminar	_	-	0	0	•	0	-	F 00	**** / 110	ate ate ate ate	ale ale ale ale	4 20	4 20	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105		****	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.53	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.57	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.90	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 55	4.50	4.50	4.34	4.45	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.40	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
	-		-	-	-	-								

Course Section: PHYS 601 0101 Title

QUANTUM MECHANICS Instructor: FRANSON, JAMES

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 8

8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1336 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Major	S
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 7	7 Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad 1	l Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0					
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	nere are not enou-	gh
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	6	_		
				?	1					

Course Section: PHYS 605 0101

Title MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS

Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1337 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_			Mean
***************************************														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	463/1669	4.62	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	516/1666	4.54	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	267/1421	4.77		4.24	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	225/1555	4.67	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2		4.83	130/1543	4.83	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.85	145/1647		4.25	4.12	4.15	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	6	2	4		1623/1668	3.69	4.85	4.67	4.83	3.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	_		298/1605	4.60		4.07		4.60
y. now would you grade one overall codoming elicociveness		ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	Ū	-	ŭ	1.00	2507 2005	1.00	1.01	1.07	1.15	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	409/1551	4.92	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	-		4.77	340/1506	4.77	4.22		4.24	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	587/1311		3.98		3.89	4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	,	1	U	U	4	3	4.00	367/1311	4.00	3.90	3.03	3.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	749/1490	4.18	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	427/1502	4.73	4.32	4.05	4.16	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.73	788/1489	4.73	4.32	4.29		4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	1	0	0	-	3.25	873/1006		3.84	4.29		3.25
4. Were special techniques successiul	2	,	1	1	U	U	2	3.25	6/3/1006	3.25	3.04	4.00	4.11	3.25
I abanatawa														
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 226	****	4 00	4 20	1 17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	1 0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.00	4.20 4.19	4.47 4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****				****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	ΤI	Τ	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	***/ 223		4.30	4.35	4.48	
Cominan														
Seminar	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	++++/ 110	****	****	4 20	4 20	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 112	^^^^	^ ^ ^ ^	4.38	4.39	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	2 00	****/ 58	****	F 00	4 22	4.53	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11				•	-	1		,		5.00	4.22		****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	***	5.00	4.06	4.57	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40		****	3.97	4.31	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****
Calf David														
Self Paced		0	0	0	0	-	-	4 50	/ 55	also also also also	4 50	4 2 4	4 45	als als als als
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.61	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Course Section: PHYS 605 0101

Title MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS

Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1337 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: PHYS 606 0101 University of Maryla Title CLASSICAL MECHANICS Baltimore County Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

9

University of Maryland Page 1338
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

O	a	The second second second	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.36	4.19	4.19	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	l 0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1605	4.17	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.98	3.85	3.89	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.50	3.84	4.00	4.11	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.47	****
Fred	quency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	<b>;</b>			Rea	ason	s			Туј	oe -			Majors	3

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

University of Mary Baltimore Count Fall 2006

? 0

Course Section: PHYS 609 0101

7

MODERN OPTICS

SHIH, YANHUA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Page 1339
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u qain new	v insights,ski	- lls from	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.67
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	984/1666		4.36	4.19	4.19	4.17
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.83
4. Did oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.80
			_	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	996/1555	3.83	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.83
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543		4.24	4.06	4.27	4.60
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	759/1647		4.25	4.12	4.15	4.33
		vas class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668		4.85	4.67		4.67
				ning effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.83
		or seem inter	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	959/1503		4.15	4.24	4.22	4.17
					0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	471/1506		4.22	4.26		4.67
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				0	2	1	0	0	3	0		1057/1311	3.25	3.98	3.85		3.25
J. 214 44	a10715441	_	_	our undersounding	Ū	-	_	Ü	Ü	5	Ü	3.23	100771011	3.23	3.70	3.05	3.03	3.23
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.83
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.46	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	407/1006	4.20	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.20
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te backs	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****
3. Were no	ecessary n	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.65	****
	Fr						trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0						Ot1	her					3						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1340

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: PHYS 614 0101 Title INTRO SURFACE PHYS Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD Fall 2006

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00 2

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.86
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.36	4.19	4.19	5.00
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.56	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.71
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.25	4.12	4.15	5.00
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.67
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.98	3.85	3.89	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	5.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	***	3.84	4.00	4.11	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ation	ı									
		-	-															
Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	.jors		1	Graduat	e	4	Majo	r	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title ATMOS PHYSICS I

Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1341 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fr	equei	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	1		1094/1666		4.36	4.19	4.19	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	466/1421		4.56	4.24	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617		4.35	4.15	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	_	4.00			3.88	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3					4.24	4.06	4.27	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2			1250/1647		4.25	4.12	4.15	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1					4.85			4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	0		1357/1605		4.04	4.07	4.13	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.45	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	770/1506	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	483/1311	4.35	3.98	3.85	3.89	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.61	****
Freq	uency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					or Ma			0	 Graduat		 4	Majo		 1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1		кес	1ulr	eu I	or M9	JOES	>	U	Graduat	E	4	Ma JC	ıΤ	Τ
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	5
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 1 F 0			ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	h
P 0		0+1						2	respons	es to k	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
3 O I O		Oth	ıer					2						

Course Section: PHYS 621 0101 University of Maryland Title JAN 18, 2007

ATMOS PHYSICS I Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1342

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	:	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	-				_		_	_									
_	-	ew insights,ski			1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80			4.80	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.80
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	3	1		1094/16		4.00	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.00
	_	estions reflec		_	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60			4.60	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.60
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40			4.40	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.40
	-	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	-, -		4.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.00
		-		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3			516/15		4.40	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.40
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	0	0	2	2	1		1250/16		3.80	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.80
	_	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	1					4.80			4.83	
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	05	3.50	4.04	4.07	4.13	3.50
		Lectur	·e																
1. Were t	the instri	actor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/15	14	4.45	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.45
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/15		5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.50			4.25	4.15	4.24		4.25
		es contribute t		-	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/15		4.70	4.22	4.26	4.24	
				our understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1			264/13						4.35
J. DIG at	uuiovisuai	r techniques en	mance y	our understanding	7	U	U	U	U	1		4.50	204/13	11	4.33	3.90	3.65	3.09	4.33
		Discus																	
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2		4.33			4.33	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.33
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33			4.33	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.33
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,		4.67	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.67
4. Were	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Were special techniques successful				3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	06	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	***
		Labora	torv																
2. Were	vou provid		_	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 2	33	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****
		structor provid			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 2		****	4.30	4.35		****
		_																	
		Field																	
				hat you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****
				uation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00		52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****
		ctor available			5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00		39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****
		could you disc			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	****	4.33	4.55	***
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	55	****	4.50	4.34	4.45	****
3. Were	your conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	5.00	4.45	4.61	***
				Frequ	encs	niet	-rihı	1+ i 01	n										
				11040	iciicy	DISC		20101											
Credits I	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5				Tyr	e			Majors	3
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3				Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	 Gradu	ate	;	4	Majo	 or	1	
28-55	<u> </u>										3								
56-83					Ger	neral	1				1	Under	-ar	rad	2	Non-	-major	5	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														3	
Grad.	4 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are					re not	enous	rh											
	=		=	P 0				responses to be signification					_	,					
				I 0		O+1	ner					2	_ 0000	~				-	
				- 0		0.01						-							

? 0

Course Section: PHYS 632 0101 University of Maryland Title THE PHYSICS OF ASTROP Baltimore County Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 1343

Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.25
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	0		1334/1666		4.36	4.19	4.19	3.75
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.25
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	558/1555	4.25	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.25
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.33
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1275/1647	3.75	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.75
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.00
		Lectur	Α															
1 Were t	he instri	actor's lecture	-	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4 00	1199/1514	4.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.00
					0	0	0	0	0	1	3		880/1551		4.76	4.66	4.72	4.75
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0	3	1		879/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	4	0		1069/1506	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.00
				our understanding	0	0	1	1	1	1	0		1227/1311	2.50	3.98	3.85	3.89	2.50
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3 00	1328/1490	3.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	3.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1		818/1502		4.32	4.26	4.46	4.33
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1		1038/1489	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.00
		echniques succe		a open discussion	1	2	0	0	1	0	0					4.00		3.00
				_														
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trıb	ut10	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	s Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	guir	 ed f	or Ma	ijors	 3	0	 Graduat	 e	4	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			1			. ,		-		-		5		_
56-83						Gei	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad	0	Non-	-major	1
84-150												3				3		
Grad.	4 3.50-4.00 0 F 0			F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Otl	her					1	_		5			
				? 0														

Baltimore County

Course Section: PHYS 690 0101

8

PROF SKILLS PHYS

HAYDEN, MICHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Page 1344 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fro	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	ı gain new			m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.50
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.63
	_			expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.75
		tions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1617		4.35	4.15	4.24	4.88
	_	-		what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	340/1555	4.50	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.50
		-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1 0	2	5 8	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.50
		system clearl as class cand		inea	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647 1/1668	5.00 5.00	4.25	4.12	4.15 4.83	5.00 5.00
	_			ching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	759/1605		4.04	4.07		4.20
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00
				n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was led	ture mate	rial presente	d and e	explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the	electures	contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.75
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.98	3.85	3.89	5.00
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.43	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.43
		_	_	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.46	5.00
		_		nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial tec	hniques succe	ssiul		1	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.00
		Semina																
				announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****
				lividual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.38	****
	_	-		what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.36	****
		s contribute			7 7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	****	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were cr	riteria io	or grading mad	e clear		/	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	^^^^/ 98	* * * *		3.95	3.93	* * * *
		Field																
	_			hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****
				uation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****
		or available			7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39 ****/ 40	****	5.00 ***	4.39	4.90	****
				r evaluations Tield activities	7 7	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.31	****
5. Dia con	irerences	neip you carr	y out I	leid activities	,	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 30			4.33	4.55	
				Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	4	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera	.1				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	5	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0											•							
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					EΙ	ecti [,]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın	
P 2 I 0						<b>∩</b> +¹	her					6	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	ıt	
				. 0 T 0		OCI	ner.					U						
				. 0														

#### Course Section: PHYS 707 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV ELECTROMAGNETIC TH Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: RUBIN, MORTON H

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

	Evaluation	

Page 1345

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC		Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	a gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.2
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.56	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.35	4.15	4.24	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.25	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.2
	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.0
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.5
	3. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.0
9. How wou	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.04	4.07	4.13	5.0
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.0
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.7
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.2
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.5
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.98	3.85	3.89	2.5
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.18	3.50
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.7
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.25	4.29	4.44	3.5
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.5
				Freq	uency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4			 aui <i>r</i>		 or Ma	ajors		 ∩	 Graduat		2	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		r.e.	quil	=u I	⊃⊥ I ^v Ic	JOIS		U	Graduat	C	4	Majo	) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ce	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General					_	onder -g	Luu	4	INOII	ilia JUI	4		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives					0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh		
craa.	4	3.30 1.00	U	P 0		111	CCCI	v CD				J	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>				2++	
				I O		O+1	her					3	I CBPOIIB		,c 5191.	ıııcaı		
				5 0		UL.	TICT					J						

Course Section: PHYS 721 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 ATMOS RADIATION

Instructor: ORAIOPOULOS, LA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1346

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	4.56	4.24	4.33	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.85	4.67	4.83	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.25	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.50

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

#### Course Section: PHYS 721 0101 University of Maryland Page 1347 JAN 18, 2007

Title ATMOS RADIATION Baltimore County Fall 2006 Instructor: (Instr. B) Job IRBR3029

		,,		
Enrollment:	2			
	0		a. 1 . a	 

FIII OITHHEILE:	۷			
Ouestionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Quagtions	MD	<b>3.</b> T.73	Frequencies			5	Instructor		Course Dept Mean Mean		UMBC Level Mean Mean		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA		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	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	4.56	4.24	4.33	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.85	4.67	4.83	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.25	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.50
Frequency Distribution														

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

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: PHYS 732 0101 University of Maryland COMP FLUID DYNAM JIANG, WEIYNAN

Enrollment:	8	
Questionnaires:	8	

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2006

Page 1348

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	Λ	Λ	0	1	1	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	7	1		1432/1666	3.60	4.36	4.19	4.19	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	0	2	1		1372/1617	3.50	4.35	4.15	4.24	3.50
	3	2	1	1	0		1		1505/1555	2.67	3.88	4.15	4.24	2.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3		1	0	0	0	J							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	-	Τ	Τ	•	U	0	3	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1312/1605	3.60	4.04	4.07	4.13	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	Ο	Ο	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	<u> </u>	4		1270/1551	4.40	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	1	1		1366/1503	3.40	4.15	4.24	4.22	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	2		1225/1506		4.22	4.24	4.24	3.40
	3	4	0			Τ.	1		-,	****				****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/1311	^ ^ ^ ^	3.98	3.85	3.89	^ ^ ^ ^
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	Ο	1	Ω	1	3 00	1328/1490	3.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	0	2		1361/1489	3.25	4.25	4.29	4.44	3.25
	4	3	U		0	0	1		****/1006		3.84	4.29	4.11	3.43 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	***/1006		3.84	4.00	4.11	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****

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