

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 106 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Astrobiology</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George,Ian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.34	4.32	4.20	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	496/1589	4.58	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	761/1391	4.38	4.19	4.34	4.29	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	3	13	4.35	731/1552	4.35	4.25	4.25	4.16	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	609/1495	4.33	3.87	4.14	4.07	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	777/1457	4.15	4.18	4.15	3.99	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	685/1572	4.38	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	9	14	1	3.67	1566/1589	3.67	4.80	4.66	4.59	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	15	4	4.15	816/1569	4.15	4.02	4.13	4.08	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	610/1530	4.68	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	270/1528	4.82	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	257/1529	4.86	4.27	4.36	4.31	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	221/1393	4.67	4.03	4.06	3.99	4.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	793/1337	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.01	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	861/1331	4.20	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	702/1333	4.50	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 106 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Astrobiology</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George,Ian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/194	****	4.23	4.17	4.36	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 106 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Astrobiology</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George, Ian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 111 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson, Eric C</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	3	15	25	30	3.96	1226/1589	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.20	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	13	27	33	4.14	1053/1589	4.14	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	6	22	43	4.30	837/1391	4.30	4.19	4.34	4.29	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	5	8	23	18	3.95	1144/1552	3.95	4.25	4.25	4.16	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	6	15	23	25	3.77	1137/1495	3.77	3.87	4.14	4.07	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	6	5	5	15	10	3.44	1298/1457	3.44	4.18	4.15	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	10	27	34	4.17	940/1572	4.17	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	4	71	4.91	467/1589	4.91	4.80	4.66	4.59	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	1	2	11	31	14	3.93	1043/1569	3.93	4.02	4.13	4.08	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	28	41	4.43	990/1530	4.43	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	10	61	4.75	977/1533	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	6	14	19	34	4.07	1135/1528	4.07	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	6	8	23	36	4.13	1105/1529	4.13	4.27	4.36	4.31	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	4	1	15	13	32	4.05	774/1393	4.05	4.03	4.06	3.99	4.05
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	8	5	5	8	3.41	1181/1337	3.41	4.07	4.17	4.01	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	1	5	6	5	8	3.56	1207/1331	3.56	4.40	4.35	4.18	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	0	4	8	3	11	3.81	1124/1333	3.81	4.25	4.40	4.22	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	52	10	1	1	7	2	5	3.56	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: <b>PHYS 111 01</b>		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: <b>225</b>				
Title: <b>Basic Physics I</b>										Questionnaires: <b>78</b>				
Instructor: <b>Anderson, Eric C</b>														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	6	11	10	20	8	3.24	173/180	3.24	4.15	4.20	4.25	3.24
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	2	4	13	21	14	3.76	158/194	3.76	4.23	4.17	4.36	3.76
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	3	3	18	31	4.40	116/178	4.40	4.35	4.47	4.57	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	2	4	5	15	29	4.18	135/181	4.18	4.25	4.40	4.54	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	12	2	4	4	11	22	4.09	103/165	4.09	3.86	4.12	4.37	4.09
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	75	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	76	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	76	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	76	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	76	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 111 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson, Eric C</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	76	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 26	Required for Majors	57	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 26						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 6	C 10	General	6	Under-grad	78	Non-major	78
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 26	F 1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 14						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 112 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson, Eric C</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	4	12	24	4.44	739/1589	4.44	4.34	4.32	4.20	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	10	27	4.50	614/1589	4.50	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	7	30	4.60	493/1391	4.60	4.19	4.34	4.29	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	2	7	9	13	4.06	1037/1552	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.16	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	8	10	20	4.12	824/1495	4.12	3.87	4.14	4.07	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	777/1457	4.15	4.18	4.15	3.99	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	9	29	4.63	358/1572	4.63	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	30	12	4.29	1322/1589	4.29	4.80	4.66	4.59	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	3	9	21	4.44	453/1569	4.44	4.02	4.13	4.08	4.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	8	29	4.57	787/1530	4.57	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	36	4.84	786/1533	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	11	26	4.48	731/1528	4.48	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	11	28	4.57	652/1529	4.57	4.27	4.36	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	4	10	27	4.56	299/1393	4.56	4.03	4.06	3.99	4.56
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.01	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	853/1331	4.21	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	817/1333	4.36	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	31	5	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 112 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson, Eric C</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	5	3	10	4	3.59	155/180	3.59	4.15	4.20	4.25	3.59
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	3	6	4	9	3.86	144/194	3.86	4.23	4.17	4.36	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	3	3	4	12	4.14	139/178	4.14	4.35	4.47	4.57	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	3	3	6	9	3.86	158/181	3.86	4.25	4.40	4.54	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	4	0	4	4	4	6	3.67	130/165	3.67	3.86	4.12	4.37	3.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	45
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	11						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>337</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>197</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	6	25	46	110	4.39	793/1589	4.39	4.34	4.32	4.20	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	1	6	18	54	108	4.40	765/1589	4.40	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	1	5	9	49	121	4.54	564/1391	4.54	4.19	4.34	4.29	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	41	3	5	25	44	68	4.17	943/1552	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	28	14	16	25	44	59	3.75	1160/1495	3.75	3.87	4.14	4.07	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	101	4	7	17	19	37	3.93	975/1457	3.93	4.18	4.15	3.99	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	4	10	44	128	4.59	398/1572	4.59	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	2	1	0	0	17	165	4.89	519/1589	4.89	4.80	4.66	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	45	4	0	3	29	60	56	4.14	829/1569	4.14	4.02	4.13	4.08	4.14
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	6	36	144	4.73	541/1530	4.73	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	5	14	168	4.87	671/1533	4.87	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	7	35	56	87	4.19	1050/1528	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	3	3	6	22	39	113	4.38	872/1529	4.38	4.27	4.36	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	5	5	28	57	90	4.20	629/1393	4.20	4.03	4.06	3.99	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	8	18	27	65	57	3.83	977/1337	3.83	4.07	4.17	4.01	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	8	30	43	92	4.23	846/1331	4.23	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	9	7	28	47	80	4.06	989/1333	4.06	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	26	39	7	5	28	46	46	3.90	641/1014	3.90	4.13	4.05	3.91	3.90

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>337</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>197</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	183	0	2	2	2	6	2	3.29	****/180	****	4.15	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	183	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	****/194	****	4.23	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	183	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	****/178	****	4.35	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	183	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	****/181	****	4.25	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	183	6	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	****/165	****	3.86	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	190	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	191	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	191	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	192	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	191	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	193	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	192	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	192	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	192	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	192	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	191	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	191	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	191	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>337</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>197</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	191	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	191	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	37	0.00-0.99 10	A 83	Required for Majors	142
28-55	29	1.00-1.99 0	B 49		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 5	C 33	General	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 17	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 41	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 28		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>223</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>98</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	8	37	49	4.39	806/1589	4.39	4.34	4.32	4.20	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	6	21	66	4.62	455/1589	4.62	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	22	67	4.61	468/1391	4.61	4.19	4.34	4.29	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	42	1	1	12	17	22	4.09	1016/1552	4.09	4.25	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	24	10	7	12	24	18	3.46	1327/1495	3.46	3.87	4.14	4.07	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	56	1	2	6	10	20	4.18	759/1457	4.18	4.18	4.15	3.99	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	14	78	4.74	244/1572	4.74	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	1	1	8	84	4.82	677/1589	4.82	4.80	4.66	4.59	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	0	11	35	31	4.26	694/1569	4.26	4.02	4.13	4.08	4.26
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	19	75	4.75	488/1530	4.75	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	14	79	4.80	872/1533	4.80	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	11	30	53	4.42	792/1528	4.42	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	0	9	23	60	4.44	806/1529	4.44	4.27	4.36	4.31	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	3	1	8	24	55	4.40	445/1393	4.40	4.03	4.06	3.99	4.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	10	28	51	4.41	550/1337	4.41	4.07	4.17	4.01	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	3	9	17	60	4.47	659/1331	4.47	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	1	11	26	49	4.30	854/1333	4.30	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	8	29	0	5	6	19	31	4.25	402/1014	4.25	4.13	4.05	3.91	4.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>223</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>98</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/180	****	4.15	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/194	****	4.23	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/178	****	4.35	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/181	****	4.25	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	95	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	****	3.86	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	96	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	96	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	96	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	96	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	96	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>223</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>98</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	95	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	95	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 56	Required for Majors 87	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	28	1.00-1.99 1	B 23		
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 8	C 11	General 2	Under-grad 98 Non-major 94
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 22	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 33	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122H 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gougousi,Theodo</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	7	2	3.90	1294/1589	3.90	4.34	4.32	4.20	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1092/1589	4.10	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	921/1391	4.20	4.19	4.34	4.29	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1352/1552	3.67	4.25	4.25	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1267/1495	3.57	3.87	4.14	4.07	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1060/1457	3.83	4.18	4.15	3.99	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	730/1589	4.80	4.80	4.66	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	6	0	3.50	1367/1569	3.50	4.02	4.13	4.08	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1273/1530	4.11	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	924/1533	4.78	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	1104/1528	4.11	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1174/1529	4.00	4.27	4.36	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1222/1393	3.33	4.03	4.06	3.99	3.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.01	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	436/1331	4.70	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	914/1333	4.20	4.25	4.40	4.22	4.20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122H 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gougousi,Theodo</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	881/1014	3.38	4.13	4.05	3.91	3.38

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	PHYS 122L 03	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	39
<b>Title:</b>	Introductory Physics Lab		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	25
<b>Instructor:</b>	Asaro,Catherine			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	10	10	4.12	1089/1589	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.20	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	12	10	4.16	1034/1589	4.16	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	893/1391	4.24	4.19	4.34	4.29	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	805/1552	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.16	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	1076/1495	3.85	3.87	4.14	4.07	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	7	12	4.21	732/1457	4.21	4.18	4.15	3.99	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	857/1572	4.24	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	882/1589	4.72	4.80	4.66	4.59	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	879/1569	4.10	4.02	4.13	4.08	4.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	12	8	4.04	1303/1530	4.04	4.41	4.49	4.45	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	1127/1533	4.64	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	14	9	4.20	1035/1528	4.20	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	6	10	3.84	1288/1529	3.84	4.27	4.36	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1142/1393	3.50	4.03	4.06	3.99	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.01	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1331	****	4.40	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1333	****	4.25	4.40	4.22	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Asaro,Catherine</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	48/180	4.53	4.15	4.20	4.25	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	91/194	4.26	4.23	4.17	4.36	4.26
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	136/178	4.16	4.35	4.47	4.57	4.16
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	87/181	4.53	4.25	4.40	4.54	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	87/165	4.21	3.86	4.12	4.37	4.21

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate 0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9					
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	7	Under-grad 25	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 1					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	0			
			? 1					

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 224 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics III</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Worchesky,Terra</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	569/1589	4.57	4.34	4.32	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	467/1589	4.61	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	320/1391	4.74	4.19	4.34	4.36	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	668/1552	4.40	4.25	4.25	4.26	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	814/1495	4.14	3.87	4.14	4.18	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	545/1457	4.38	4.18	4.15	4.14	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	540/1572	4.48	4.06	4.21	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	369/1569	4.50	4.02	4.13	4.12	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	364/1530	4.83	4.41	4.49	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	670/1528	4.52	4.16	4.35	4.35	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	488/1529	4.70	4.27	4.36	4.39	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	4	7	8	4.00	796/1393	4.00	4.03	4.06	4.13	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1106/1337	3.57	4.07	4.17	4.16	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	919/1331	4.14	4.40	4.35	4.32	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	866/1333	4.29	4.25	4.40	4.39	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	16	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	4.03	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 224 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 34
<b>Title:</b> Introductory Physics III		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 23
<b>Instructor:</b> Worchesky,Terra		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.23	4.17	4.12	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 303 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Thermal/Statistical Phys</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCann, Kevin J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	557/1589	4.58	4.34	4.32	4.33	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	815/1589	4.37	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	376/1391	4.68	4.19	4.34	4.30	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	816/1552	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	995/1495	3.93	3.87	4.14	4.11	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	1197/1572	3.89	4.06	4.21	4.18	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	546/1569	4.38	4.02	4.13	4.10	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	134/1530	4.95	4.41	4.49	4.49	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	757/1533	4.84	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	377/1528	4.74	4.16	4.35	4.33	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	270/1529	4.84	4.27	4.36	4.34	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	258/1393	4.61	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1331	****	4.40	4.35	4.35	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 303 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 24
<b>Title:</b> Thermal/Statistical Phys		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 19
<b>Instructor:</b> McCann, Kevin J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1333	****	4.25	4.40	4.41	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 304 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Fundamentals of Astronom</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Henriksen,Mark</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1271/1589	3.93	4.34	4.32	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	2	3.57	1453/1589	3.57	4.14	4.29	4.26	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	4	2	3.29	1330/1391	3.29	4.19	4.34	4.30	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1552	4.60	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	643/1495	4.31	3.87	4.14	4.11	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	768/1457	4.17	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1226/1572	3.86	4.06	4.21	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	373/1589	4.93	4.80	4.66	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	902/1569	4.08	4.02	4.13	4.10	4.08
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	11	2	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.41	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1127/1533	4.64	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1393/1528	3.57	4.16	4.35	4.33	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	4	2	3.29	1454/1529	3.29	4.27	4.36	4.34	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	7	3	1	3.45	1168/1393	3.45	4.03	4.06	4.10	3.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1331	****	4.40	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1333	****	4.25	4.40	4.41	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 304 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 20
<b>Title:</b> Fundamentals of Astronom		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 14
<b>Instructor:</b> Henriksen,Mark		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	4.04	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	PHYS 330L 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	12
<b>Title:</b>	Optics Laboratory		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	10
<b>Instructor:</b>	Pittman, Todd B.			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	156/1589	4.95	4.34	4.32	4.33	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	467/1589	4.72	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.19	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	509/1552	4.63	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	899/1495	4.13	3.87	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	154/1457	4.81	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	441/1572	4.44	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	211/1569	4.85	4.02	4.13	4.10	4.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	259/1530	4.89	4.41	4.49	4.49	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	643/1533	4.94	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	195/1528	4.94	4.16	4.35	4.33	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	530/1529	4.68	4.27	4.36	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	349/1393	4.38	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.50
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	21/180	4.90	4.15	4.20	4.08	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	26/194	4.86	4.23	4.17	4.05	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	36/178	4.95	4.35	4.47	4.42	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	24/181	4.95	4.25	4.40	4.31	4.90

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 330L 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 12
<b>Title:</b> Optics Laboratory		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 10
<b>Instructor:</b> Pittman, Todd B.		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	75/165	4.36	3.86	4.12	3.94	4.30

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 330L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Optics Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Pittman,Todd B.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1589	4.95	4.34	4.32	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1589	4.72	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.19	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	238/1552	4.63	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	693/1495	4.13	3.87	4.14	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	115/1457	4.81	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	735/1572	4.44	4.06	4.21	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1569	4.85	4.02	4.13	4.10	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1530	4.89	4.41	4.49	4.49	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1533	4.94	4.75	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1528	4.94	4.16	4.35	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	474/1529	4.68	4.27	4.36	4.34	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	586/1393	4.38	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1331	****	4.40	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	****	4.25	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 330L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Optics Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Pittman, Todd B.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/180	4.90	4.15	4.20	4.08	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	17/194	4.86	4.23	4.17	4.05	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/178	4.95	4.35	4.47	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/181	4.95	4.25	4.40	4.31	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	51/165	4.36	3.86	4.12	3.94	4.42

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 403 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Solid State Physics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Takacs,Laszlo</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>3</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	435/1589	4.67	4.34	4.32	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1250/1391	3.67	4.19	4.34	4.46	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	341/1552	4.67	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1381/1495	3.33	3.87	4.14	4.25	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1334/1572	3.67	4.06	4.21	4.28	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.02	4.13	4.22	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.41	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	909/1528	4.33	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	530/1529	4.67	4.27	4.36	4.44	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 403 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Solid State Physics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Takacs,Laszlo</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>3</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	796/1393	4.00	4.03	4.06	4.18	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 405 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Stellar Astrophysics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Henriksen,Mark</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1465/1589	3.60	4.34	4.32	4.46	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1557/1589	3.00	4.14	4.29	4.35	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1364/1391	3.00	4.19	4.34	4.46	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1552	****	4.25	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	416/1495	4.50	3.87	4.14	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1509/1572	3.00	4.06	4.21	4.28	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.22	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1420/1530	3.80	4.41	4.49	4.56	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1350/1533	4.40	4.75	4.75	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1171/1528	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1174/1529	4.00	4.27	4.36	4.44	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 405 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Stellar Astrophysics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Henriksen,Mark</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.36	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 407 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Electromagnetic Theory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCann, Kevin J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	316/1589	4.75	4.34	4.32	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	802/1589	4.38	4.14	4.29	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	761/1391	4.38	4.19	4.34	4.46	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	795/1552	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	3	2	6	3.79	1130/1495	3.79	3.87	4.14	4.25	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	593/1457	4.33	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	4.06	4.21	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	369/1569	4.50	4.02	4.13	4.22	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	276/1530	4.88	4.41	4.49	4.56	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	843/1533	4.81	4.75	4.75	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	620/1528	4.56	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	502/1529	4.69	4.27	4.36	4.44	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	543/1393	4.31	4.03	4.06	4.18	4.31
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1331	****	4.40	4.35	4.56	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 407 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Electromagnetic Theory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCann, Kevin J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	****	4.25	4.40	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 4		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 425 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Relativistic Physics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Georganopoulos,</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	557/1589	4.57	4.34	4.32	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1053/1589	4.14	4.14	4.29	4.35	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1061/1391	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	756/1552	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	609/1495	4.33	3.87	4.14	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1457	****	4.18	4.15	4.30	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	420/1572	4.57	4.06	4.21	4.28	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1589	4.71	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1125/1569	3.86	4.02	4.13	4.22	3.86
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	787/1530	4.57	4.41	4.49	4.56	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1205/1533	4.57	4.75	4.75	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1283/1528	3.86	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	974/1529	4.29	4.27	4.36	4.44	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1142/1393	3.50	4.03	4.06	4.18	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1337	****	4.07	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1331	****	4.40	4.35	4.56	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 425 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 7
<b>Title:</b> Relativistic Physics		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 7
<b>Instructor:</b> Georganopoulos,		

  

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1333	****	4.25	4.40	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 431L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Physics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Martins,Jose V</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	957/1589	4.25	4.34	4.32	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1568/1589	2.75	4.14	4.29	4.35	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	899/1495	4.00	3.87	4.14	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1563/1572	2.00	4.06	4.21	4.28	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1564/1569	2.00	4.02	4.13	4.22	2.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1512/1530	3.00	4.41	4.49	4.56	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1476/1533	4.00	4.75	4.75	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1482/1528	3.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1368/1529	3.67	4.27	4.36	4.44	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1142/1393	3.50	4.03	4.06	4.18	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.36	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.25	4.40	4.63	5.00
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	148/180	3.75	4.15	4.20	4.31	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	158/194	3.75	4.23	4.17	4.27	3.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 431L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Physics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Martins,Jose V</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	168/178	3.50	4.35	4.47	4.32	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	176/181	3.00	4.25	4.40	4.37	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	164/165	2.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.50

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 601 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Quantum Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Franson,James D</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1182/1589	4.00	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	614/1589	4.50	4.14	4.29	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	301/1391	4.75	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1552	5.00	4.25	4.25	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	508/1495	4.43	3.87	4.14	4.18	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1457	4.71	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	368/1572	4.63	4.06	4.21	4.29	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	658/1569	4.29	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.41	4.49	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	206/1528	4.88	4.16	4.35	4.38	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	397/1529	4.75	4.27	4.36	4.38	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 601 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 8
<b>Title:</b> Quantum Mechanics		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 8
<b>Instructor:</b> Franson,James D		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	697/1393	4.14	4.03	4.06	3.91	4.14

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 602 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Statistical Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sparling,Lynn C</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1465/1589	3.60	4.34	4.32	4.39	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1519/1589	3.30	4.14	4.29	4.33	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1298/1391	3.50	4.19	4.34	4.40	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1381/1552	3.60	4.25	4.25	4.30	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	0	2	2	0	2.25	1488/1495	2.25	3.87	4.14	4.18	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	711/1457	4.22	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1464/1572	3.30	4.06	4.21	4.29	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1556/1589	3.80	4.80	4.66	4.79	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	6	2	0	2.80	1535/1569	2.80	4.02	4.13	4.18	2.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1503/1530	3.10	4.41	4.49	4.55	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	586/1533	4.90	4.75	4.75	4.82	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	0	2	1	2.50	1514/1528	2.50	4.16	4.35	4.38	2.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 602 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 10
<b>Title:</b> Statistical Mechanics		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 10
<b>Instructor:</b> Sparling,Lynn C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1489/1529	3.00	4.27	4.36	4.38	3.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 605 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mathematical Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Georganopoulos,</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	780/1589	4.40	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	891/1589	4.30	4.14	4.29	4.33	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	921/1391	4.20	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	756/1552	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	899/1495	4.00	3.87	4.14	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1457	4.71	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	176/1572	4.80	4.06	4.21	4.29	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	467/1589	4.90	4.80	4.66	4.79	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	879/1569	4.10	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	577/1530	4.70	4.41	4.49	4.55	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1047/1533	4.70	4.75	4.75	4.82	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1171/1528	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1129/1529	4.10	4.27	4.36	4.38	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1393	****	4.03	4.06	3.91	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	601/1337	4.33	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1331	****	4.40	4.35	4.51	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> PHYS 605 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 11
<b>Title:</b> Mathematical Physics I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 10
<b>Instructor:</b> Georganopoulos,		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	****	4.25	4.40	4.51	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 606 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Classical Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kramer,Ivan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1419/1589	3.67	4.14	4.29	4.33	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	954/1391	4.17	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1307/1495	3.50	3.87	4.14	4.18	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1555/1572	2.50	4.06	4.21	4.29	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1476/1569	3.20	4.02	4.13	4.18	3.20
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1447/1530	3.67	4.41	4.49	4.55	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	786/1533	4.83	4.75	4.75	4.82	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1509/1528	2.67	4.16	4.35	4.38	2.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 606 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Classical Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kramer,Ivan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1474/1529	3.17	4.27	4.36	4.38	3.17

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 609 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Optics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shih,Yan-hua</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1047/1589	4.17	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1308/1589	3.83	4.14	4.29	4.33	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	341/1552	4.67	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1086/1495	3.83	3.87	4.14	4.18	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1572	4.50	4.06	4.21	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1095/1530	4.33	4.41	4.49	4.55	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	786/1533	4.83	4.75	4.75	4.82	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1171/1528	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1081/1529	4.17	4.27	4.36	4.38	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1393	****	4.03	4.06	3.91	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	337/1337	4.67	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.25	4.40	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1014	5.00	4.13	4.05	4.13	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 609 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Optics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shih,Yan-hua</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.23	4.17	4.15	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.22	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.10	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 690 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prof Skills Phys</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hayden,L M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1089/1589	4.13	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	511/1589	4.57	4.14	4.29	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	900/1552	4.20	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1239/1495	3.63	3.87	4.14	4.18	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1129/1457	3.75	4.18	4.15	4.30	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1211/1572	3.88	4.06	4.21	4.29	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1589	4.75	4.80	4.66	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	887/1530	4.50	4.41	4.49	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1181/1533	4.60	4.75	4.75	4.82	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	992/1528	4.25	4.16	4.35	4.38	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	739/1529	4.50	4.27	4.36	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1142/1393	3.50	4.03	4.06	3.91	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	452/1337	4.50	4.07	4.17	4.29	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	623/1331	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.51	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1300/1333	3.00	4.25	4.40	4.51	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	4.13	4.05	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 690 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prof Skills Phys</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hayden,L M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.22	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 707 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Electromagnetic Thry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kramer,Ivan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	871/1589	4.33	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	853/1589	4.33	4.14	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	954/1391	4.17	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1421/1552	3.50	4.25	4.25	4.30	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1307/1495	3.50	3.87	4.14	4.18	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1087/1457	3.80	4.18	4.15	4.30	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	152/1572	4.83	4.06	4.21	4.29	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	596/1569	4.33	4.02	4.13	4.18	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.83	4.41	4.49	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1100/1533	4.67	4.75	4.75	4.82	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.38	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 707 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Electromagnetic Thry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kramer,Ivan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	924/1529	4.33	4.27	4.36	4.38	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 721 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Radiative Transfer</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>De souza-machad</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1589	4.75	4.34	4.32	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	943/1589	4.25	4.14	4.29	4.33	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1061/1391	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	756/1552	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	693/1495	4.25	3.87	4.14	4.18	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1457	4.75	4.18	4.15	4.30	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	4.06	4.21	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1589	4.75	4.80	4.66	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1277/1569	3.67	4.02	4.13	4.18	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.41	4.49	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1261/1533	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.82	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.38	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 721 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Radiative Transfer</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>De souza-machad</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1529	5.00	4.27	4.36	4.38	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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