University of Maryland Page 1115
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		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 von	ı dəin ne	General ew insights,skills f	com this course	1	0	0	1	2	15	24	4.48	626/1447	4.48	4.64	4.31	4.18	4.48
_	_	ctor make clear the		1	0	0	0	5	10	27	4.52	510/1447		4.47	4.27	4.30	4.52
		estions reflect the	_	2	0	0	2	2	7	30	4.59	469/1241		4.50	4.33	4.25	4.59
	_	lations reflect the	_	1	15	2	0	3	6	16	4.26	766/1402		4.39	4.24	4.15	4.26
		eadings contribute to	_	1	6	0	2	3	7	24	4.47	377/1358		4.38	4.11	4.03	4.47
	_	signments contribute	_	1	21	1	0	3	6	11	4.24			4.47	4.14	3.99	4.24
		g system clearly exp	_	1	0	0	1	6	5	30	4.52			4.42	4.19	4.24	4.52
		, ,	Lained	3	0	0	0	1	4	35	4.85	619/1447		4.42	4.19		4.85
	-	was class cancelled		3 7		0	1									4.68	
. HOW WOU	ııa you g	grade the overall te	acning effectiveness	/	1	U	Т	1	19	14	4.31	565/1434	4.31	4.30	4.10	4.10	4.31
		Lecture															
l. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures well	l prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	34	4.74	460/1387	4.74	4.64	4.46	4.46	4.74
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	579/1387	4.88	4.87	4.73	4.71	4.88
		terial presented and		1	0	0	1	4	12	25	4.45	677/1386	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.45
		es contribute to wha		1	0	0	2	0	7	33	4.69	420/1380		4.46	4.32	4.31	4.69
		l techniques enhance	-	1	1	1	0	4	12	24	4.41	367/1193		4.32	4.02		4.41
. 214 440		r coominguos cimianos	your andersounding	_	_	_	Ü	-				30., 1133		1.52	1.02	3.33	
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to	-	34	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	3.95	****
		nts actively encoura		34	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage fair	and open discussion	34	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques successful		35	4	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 800	****	4.52	4.06	3.95	****
		Laboratory															
l Did the	a lah ind	crease understanding	of the material	14	0	3	4	5	10	7	3.48	174/ 189	3.48	4.21	4.34	4.18	3.48
		ded with adequate ba		14	0	0	1	5	8	15	4.28	130/ 192		4.35	4.34	4.31	4.28
_	_	materials available	_	14	0	0	0	4	12	13	4.31	145/ 186		4.38	4.48	4.46	4.31
	_	structor provide ass		14	1	0	1	3	11	13	4.29	119/ 187		4.46	4.33	4.37	4.29
		_		14	8	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	45/ 168					
o. were re	equiremen	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	14	8	U	U	3	4	14	4.52	45/ 168	4.52	4.18	4.20	4.29	4.52
		Seminar															
L. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant to the	ne announced theme	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.78	4.58	3.95	****
			Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
							_					_				'	
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ເຮ 			Ту	pe 			Majors	5
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 15		Red	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	rs 2	25	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	в 10														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 5		Ger	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 4	13	Non-	-major	43
50-83	9	3.00-3.49 6	D 1									3				-	
84-150											2	0.00.00	Maa.a. +	homo r	220 201	onous	rh
	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0		EI⊥€	ecti	ves				4	#### -	means t	illere c	41 E 110 L	, emous	
84-150	-	3.50-4.00 12	F 0 P 0		ΕTE	3CLI	ves				2					_	111
84-150	-	3.50-4.00 12	= -		E16		ves				1	#### - respons				_	111

Course-Section: PHYS 111 01

Title Basic Physics I Instructor: Anderson, Eric C

Enrollment: 176
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2010

Page 1116

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 160 Questionnaires: 37 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHYS 112 01

Basic Physics II

Anderson, Eric C

Title

Instructor:

Quebelom	lair Cb.	57		50	Judene Cot	AI DC	пναι	uaci	011 Q	ucbc	10111.	iall	•						
								Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this cou	ırse	1	0	0	0	3	9	24	4.58	496/1447	4.58	4.64	4.31	4.18	4.58
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goa	als	1	0	0	0	0	9	27	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected go	oals	1	0	0	1	1	12	22	4.53	523/1241	4.53	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.53
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goa	als	1	15	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.39	4.24	4.15	4.29
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you l	learned	1	0	1	3	5	11	16	4.06	772/1358	4.06	4.38	4.11	4.03	4.06
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you	ı learned	2	19	4	0	1	5	6	3.56	1106/1316	3.56	4.47	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained		1	0	1	0	4	3	28	4.58	361/1427	4.58	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.58
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled			2	0	0	0	1	0	34	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effec	ctiveness	5	0	0	0	2	14	16	4.44	420/1434	4.44	4.30	4.10	4.10	4.44
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	the instr			prepared		4	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	383/1387	4.79	4.64	4.46	4.46	4.79
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	681/1387		4.87		4.71	4.85
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	1	9	23	4.67	431/1386		4.38	4.32	4.32	4.67
	as lecture material presented and explained cleamed the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	379/1380		4.46	4.32	4.31	4.73
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	1	0	1	10	21	4.52			4.32	4.02	3.99	4.52
		Discus	aion																
1 Did al	laga diga	ussions contrib		what would	loarnod	29	0	1	0	4	1	2	2 20	****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	3.95	****
		nts actively en		_		29	0	0	1	1	3	3		****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.18	****
		ctor encourage				29	0	1	0	0	3			****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.17	****
		echniques succe		na open ars	cussion	29	5	0	1	1	0			****/ 800	****	4.52		3.95	***
1 1 - 1		Labora	_	6 . 1		0.1	0	0	_	2	_	•	2 21	100/100	2 21	4 01	4 24	4 10	2 21
		crease understa	_			21	0	2	2	3	7			180/ 189				4.18	3.31
		ded with adequa				21	0	1	1	1	6	7		, -		4.35		4.31	4.06
		materials avai			civities	21	0	2	1	0	5	8	4.00	160/ 186		4.38	4.48	4.46	4.00
		structor provid				21 22	0	3 0	0 2	0	5	8	3.94	152/ 187		4.46	4.33	4.37	3.94
5. were 1	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specifie						3	U	2	0	3	7	4.25	84/ 168	4.25	4.18	4.20	4.29	4.25
					Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	ed Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	 14		Re	guir	ed f	 or M	ajor	s 2		 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11		_				· J						,		-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3		Ge:	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad 3	37	Non-	-major	37

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	3						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 01 Title

Introductory Physics I

Instructor: Cui,Lili

Enrollment: 272 Questionnaires: 106

University of Maryland Page 1117 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	_	ncie	:s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	2	0	3	4	12	34	51	4.21	909/1447	4.21	4.64	4.31	4.18	4.21
2. Did the instructo			2	0	3	6	7	30	58	4.29	824/1447	4.29	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam que		_	2	0	2	4	8	35	55	4.32	734/1241	4.32	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.32
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	xpected goals	2	47	1	2	14	21	19	3.96	1016/1402	3.96	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.96
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	3	22	5	4	15	21	36	3.98	834/1358	3.98	4.38	4.11	4.03	3.98
6. Did written assig	gnments contribute	to what you learned	3	63	1	4	7	8	20	4.05	785/1316	4.05	4.47	4.14	3.99	4.05
7. Was the grading		ained	2	0	5	2	7	25	65	4.38	632/1427	4.38	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times wa			2	0	0	1	1	2	100	4.93	,	4.93	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	10	1	3	9	32	40	11	3.49	1241/1434	3.49	4.30	4.10	4.10	3.49
	T															
1. Were the instruct	Lecture		62	0	1	0	_	0	20	4 50	798/1387	4.50	4.64	1 10	1 10	4 50
2. Did the instruct			64	0	1 0	0	1	10	30 31	4.50 4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.87	4.46 4.73	4.46 4.71	4.50 4.71
3. Was lecture mate		_	63	0	4	4	7	15	13		1217/1386	3.67	4.38	4.73	4.71	3.67
4. Did the lectures			63	0	5	5	6	7	20		1172/1380	3.74	4.46	4.32	4.32	3.74
5. Did audiovisual		-	62	2	5	3	6	8	20	3.83	,		4.32	4.02		3.83
5. Did dadiovidadi	occimizates cimicinos	your anacipouncing	0.5	_			ŭ	Ü		3.03	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	3.03	1.52	1.02	3.77	3.03
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	78	0	0	3	1	3	21	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.47	4.15	3.95	4.50
2. Were all students	1 5		78	0	2	1	5	2	18	4.18	781/1182	4.18	4.55	4.35	4.18	4.18
3. Did the instruct	_	nd open discussion	79	0	1	1	7	4	14	4.07	854/1170	4.07	4.50	4.38	4.17	4.07
4. Were special tech	hniques successful		79	6	1	2	2	3	13	4.19	****/ 800	****	4.52	4.06	3.95	****
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incre	-	of the material	105	0	1	0	0	Ο	٥	1 00	****/ 189	****	4.21	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided				0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 192	****	4.35	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary ma	_	_	105	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 186	****	4.38	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab inst			105	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 187	****	4.46	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements	_		105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.18	4.20	4.29	****
		_			.,											
		Freq	uency	Dist	cribu	ıtio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	;
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	 А	35	Required for Majors 7		Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	21	1.00-1.99	0	В	35						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	106	Non-major	103
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	31	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	s there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 01

Introductory Physics I

Instructor: Cui,Lili
Enrollment: 225

Questionnaires: 125

Title

Cui, Lili

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1118 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	0	11	41	67	4.44			4.64	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	3	2	15	40	60	4.27	843/1447		4.47	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	4	2	9	46	58	4.28	766/1241		4.50	4.33	4.25	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	45	5	3	11	31	24		1082/1402		4.39	4.24	4.15	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	2	15	31	51	4.23	635/1358		4.38	4.11	4.03	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		63	4	5	4	21	22	3.93	890/1316		4.47	4.14	3.99	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	3	5	25	86	4.60	337/1427		4.42	4.19	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	5		105	4.82	700/1447		4.85	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	5	1	39	48	15	3.62	1175/1434	3.83	4.30	4.10	4.10	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	2	0	5	19	64	4.59	684/1387	4.69	4.64	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	2	16	72	4.78	829/1387		4.87	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	38	0	4	4	23	27	29		1160/1386		4.38	4.32	4.32	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	6	5	19	22	38		1104/1380		4.46	4.32	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	3	2	4	13	19	44		517/1193			4.02		4.21
5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	40	3	4	4	13	19	44	4.21	517/1193	4.34	4.32	4.02	3.33	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	5	6	14	13	15	3.51	999/1172	3.68	4.47	4.15	3.95	3.51
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	73	0	5	2	11	12	22	3.85	974/1182		4.55	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	4	5	12	8	21	3.74	991/1170	3.87	4.50	4.38	4.17	3.74
4. Were special techniques successful	73	14	1	4	6	6	21	4.11	407/ 800	4.11	4.52	4.06	3.95	4.11
Laboratory					_		_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	123	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 189		4.21	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 192		4.35	4.34	4.31	****
	123	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 186		4.38	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	122	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 187		4.46	4.33	4.37	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	122	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	3.93	4.18	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	123	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.78	4.58	3.95	****
-	122	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	124	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	124	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.25	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	123	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	123	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	124	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	4.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	124	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	4.50	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	123	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	124	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 15		4.00	4.61	4.31	****
J. Here effects enough proceeds for all the students	127	U	U	_	U	J	U	2.00	, 15		1.00	1.01	1.01	

Course-Section: PHYS 122 01

Title Introductory Physics I

Instructor: Cui, Lili

Questionnaires: 125

Enrollment: 225

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1118 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	;
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	44	Required for Majors	99	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	20	1.00-1.99	1	В	55						
56-83	23	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	125	Non-major	117
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	46	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	rh
				P	0			responses to	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 01

Title Introductory Physics L

Instructor: Gougousi, Theodo

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1119 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	518/1447	4.50	4.64	4.31	4.18	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	7	16	4.48	561/1447	4.37	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	1	0	1	11	4.43	634/1241	4.35	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	425/1402	4.23	4.39	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	599/1358	4.24	4.38	4.11	4.03	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	212/1316	4.31	4.47	4.14	3.99	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	4	18	4.44	541/1427	4.52	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	388/1447	4.87	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	10	6	4.05	828/1434	3.83	4.30	4.10	4.10	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	368/1387	4.69	4.64	4.46	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	707/1387	4.81	4.87	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	847/1386	4.07	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	5	13	4.13	984/1380	4.01	4.46	4.32	4.31	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	3	17	4.48	314/1193	4.34	4.32	4.02	3.99	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	830/1172	3.68	4.47	4.15	3.95	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	968/1182	3.85	4.55	4.35	4.18	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	864/1170	3.87	4.50	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 800	4.11	4.52	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	102/ 189	4.40	4.21	4.34	4.18	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	47/ 192	4.73	4.35	4.34	4.31	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	15/ 186	4.93	4.38	4.48	4.46	4.93
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	95/ 187	4.53	4.46	4.33	4.37	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	122/ 168	3.93	4.18	4.20	4.29	3.93

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Ā	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHYS 220 01 University of Maryland

Title Intro Computational Ph Baltimore County
Instructor: McCann, Kevin J Spring 2010

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 14

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 1120

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Questions	5 		INIX.	NA				- 4		меан	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	201/1447	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.31	4.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	376/1447	4.64	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.64
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	hat you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1358	4.63	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.63
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.08	5.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.42	4.19	4.14	4.57
	-	was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.30	4.10	3.97	4.50
		Lecture																
		actor's lecture:	_	-	1		0	0	0			5.00					4.42	
		ctor seem inter			1		0	0	0			4.85	,	4.85	4.87	4.73		
		-		plained clearly	1		0		0			4.85	206/1386	4.85	4.38	4.32	4.24	4.85
		es contribute to			1		0	1				4.69	420/1380			4.32	4.30	4.69
5. Did au	diovisua.	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.32	4.02	4.04	4.75
		5.1																
ו היים ו		Discus		hat you learned	1 2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/1172	++++	1 17	4 1 5	4 10	****
					13 13		0	0	1 0	0			****/1182		4.47	4.15	4.12	****
				l to participate l open discussion	13		0	0	0	-	_		****/1170			4.35		****
3. DIG til	e mstruc	ctor encourage .	Lair and	open discussion	13	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/11/0		4.50	4.30	4.34	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera!	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	1
84-150		3.00-3.49	3	D 0											_			
Grad.	1. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 224 01 University of Maryland Title

Introductory Physics I Baltimore County Instructor: De souza-machad Spring 2010

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	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	2	2	4	4.25	869/1447	4.25	4.64	4.31	4.31	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	1	2	3.25	1372/1447	3.25	4.47	4.27	4.23	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	0	2	3.13	1209/1241	3.13	4.50	4.33	4.35	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	0	2.83	1379/1402	2.83	4.39	4.24	4.24	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.00	4.38	4.11	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1200/1316	3.33	4.47	4.14	4.08	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1388/1427	2.67	4.42	4.19	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	998/1447	4.63	4.85	4.69	4.70	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1334/1434	3.14	4.30	4.10	3.97	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1320/1387	3.38	4.64	4.46	4.42	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1214/1387	4.38	4.87	4.73	4.71	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	1328/1386	3.00	4.38	4.32	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1211/1380	3.63	4.46	4.32	4.30	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1193	****	4.32	4.02	4.04	****

Page 1121

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: PHYS 320L 01

Title Electronics for Scient

Instructor: Hendrickson, Sco

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1122 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollive')	Evaluation	Ougetion	n n n n n

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	1	0	0	0	_	2	1.0	4 50	406/1447	4 50	1 (1	4 21	4 20	4.59
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2 3	3 4	12 9	4.59	496/1447 715/1447	4.59 4.38	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2 1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.38	646/1241	4.38	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	3	9	4.41	616/1402	4.41	4.39	4.33	4.33	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	2	<i>3</i> 5	_	-							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		-	•	_	_	0	6		1015/1358	3.77	4.38	4.11	4.10	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	444/1316	4.45	4.47	4.14	4.13	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	554/1427	4.44	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.85	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	./	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.30	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1085/1387	4.20	4.64	4.46	4.44	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.87	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	877/1380	4.27	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	879/1193	3.69	4.32	4.02	4.05	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1182	****	4.55	4.15	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	~~~/11/0	***	4.50	4.38	4.49	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	77/ 189	4.56	4.21	4.34	4.26	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	100/ 192	4.44	4.35	4.34	4.20	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	119/ 186	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.36	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	44/ 187	4.78	4.46	4.33	4.11	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	137/ 168	3.78	4.18	4.20	4.02	3.78
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				6	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 321 01 University of Maryland Title Intermediate Mechanics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Worchesky, Terra

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

84-150

Grad.

5

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

D 0

F

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

2

	Š	Spring 2010	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 1123

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

		0	_			373		equei		s	-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	342/1447	4.73	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	4.09	999/1447	4.09	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.09
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	7	4.23	806/1241	4.23	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.23
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.39	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	ute to	what you learned	0	4	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.38	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.47	4.14	4.13	4.43
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	704/1427	4.32	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.32
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	243/1447	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.65	4.95
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	270/1434	4.61	4.30	4.10	4.09	4.61
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	100/1387	4.95	4.64	4.46	4.44	4.95
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.71
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	16	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1193	***	4.32	4.02	4.05	***
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	4.24	****
				d to participate	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.42	***
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage i	fair an	d open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful	-	19	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	4.52	4.06	4.12	***
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Por	ason	a			Ту	00			Majors	
CLEGICS E	ariiea	Cuiii. GPA		Expedied Grades					25011	.a 				 PE			S	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 2	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 8		Ger	nera!	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	5
0/1_150	E	2 00-2 40	6	D 0														

Electives

1

Other

Course-Section: PHYS 324 01
Title Modern Physics
Instructor: Reno,Robert C

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1124 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 I															
1 Did voi	ı gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	=	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	507/1447	4.57	4.64	4.31	4.32	4.57
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	575/1447	4.48	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.48
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.33
		ations reflect			0	8	0	2	0	1	10	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.39	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.38	4.11	4.10	4.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.47	4.14	4.13	4.60
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	z expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	154/1427	4.81	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.81
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	374/1434	4.47	4.30	4.10	4.09	4.47
		Lectur	_															
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	414/1387	4.76	4.64	4.46	4.44	4.76
		tor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	844/1387	4.76	4.87	4.73	4.71	4.76
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	649/1386	4.48	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.48
		s contribute to			0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	534/1380	4.62	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	6	2	0	0	4	7	4.08	624/1193	4.08	4.32	4.02	4.05	4.08
		Discus																
				what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	0	1		****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	4.24	****
				d to participate	17	0	2	0	0	0	2		****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.42	****
				d open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	1	1		****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.52	4.06	4.12	****
		Labora	-															
				f the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 189	****	4.21	4.34	4.26	****
				ground information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 192	****	4.35	4.34	4.20	****
	_			or lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	4.38	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.46	4.33	4.11	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 3		Pac			or Ma				Graduat		0	Majo		19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		1/6	14116	.u ()	בט כ.	. Z	U	Graduati	_	J	Majo	-	19
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 6		Ger	neral					0	Under-q	rad 2	:1	Non-	major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-					5	=
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	-			P 0									respons					
				I O		Oth	ıer					0			5			
				2 1														

Course-Section: PHYS 408 01 University of Maryland Optics

Title Baltimore County Pittman,Todd B. Instructor: Spring 2010

Page 1125

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

			Fre	eguei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Λ	0	Ω	4	17	4.81	254/1447	4.81	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3.	18	4.86	154/1447	4.86	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	141/1241	4.90	4.50	4.33	4.41	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	238/1402	4.74	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	1	14	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.38	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	237/1427	4.71	4.42	4.19	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	928/1447	4.70	4.85	4.69	4.72	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	93/1434		4.30	4.10	4.17	4.89
	_		•	-	-	_			,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	120/1387	4.95	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	82/1386	4.95	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.46	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	72/1193	4.88	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.52	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar		_		_	_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 66		4.78	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62		5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	4.43	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	2	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 415 01 University of Maryland Page 1126 Title Observational Astronom Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: George, Ian M

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1402		4.39	4.24	4.34	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1359/1427	3.00	4.42	4.19	4.20	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1252/1447	4.25	4.85	4.69	4.72	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.30	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4 25	1039/1387	4.25	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.47	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.55	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.50	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.52	4.06	4.19	4.00

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

Course-Section: PHYS 424 01 University of Maryland Page 1127 Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Intro Quantam Mechanic

Instructor: Takacs,Laszlo

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	3	4	7		1114/1447	3.94	4.47	4.27	4.31	3.94
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	2	4	7	2		1159/1241	3.44	4.50	4.33	4.41	3.44
	_	uations reflect		_	0	8	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1264/1402	3.50	4.39	4.24	4.34	3.50
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.38	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did wri	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	671/1316	4.20	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.20
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	775/1427	4.25	4.42	4.19	4.20	4.25
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.85	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How wou	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1081/1434	3.77	4.30	4.10	4.17	3.77
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well :	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	958/1387	4.69	4.87	4.73	4.76	4.69
3. Was led	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	1022/1386	4.06	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.06
		es contribute t		-	0	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	887/1380	4.25	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.25
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	5	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	983/1193	3.44	4.32	4.02	4.00	3.44
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	4.25	****
				d to participate	13	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/1182		4.55	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	13	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.51	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3		 Re	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s 1	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			-1		10			-	or addac	-	-			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 7		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				3 -	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	jh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						

Course-Section: PHYS 431 01 University of Maryland Title Modern Physics Lab

Baltimore County

Instructor: Wu,E S Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

56-83

84-150

Grad.

0

3

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

0

0

С

D

F

Ρ

I

1

0

0

0

0 0

JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1128

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

			Fre	eauer	ncies	;		Inst	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	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1241	****	4.50	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	663/1358	4.20	4.38	4.11	4.15	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.47	4.14	4.27	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.42	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.30	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	***	4.32	4.02	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	87/ 189	4.50	4.21	4.34	4.74	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	176/ 192	3.60	4.35	4.34	4.61	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	85/ 186	4.60	4.38	4.48	4.72	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	131/ 187	4.20	4.46	4.33	4.59	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	64/ 168	4.40	4.18	4.20	4.53	4.40
Freque	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	:			Туј	pe.			Majors	
						. – – – -								
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	4	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	5
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3														

General

Other

Electives

0

0

0

Under-grad

5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Non-major

Course-Section: PHYS 450 08
Title Special Topics
Instructor: George, Ian M
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1129 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Instructor			Course Dept				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	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447		4.47	4.27	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.50	4.30	4.10	4.17	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.42	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.72	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 30	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.38	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.62	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons Type				Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1	
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	Non-major	0	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				2	Λ							

Course-Section: PHYS 450 16
Title Special Topics
Instructor: Martins, Jose V
Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1130 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Courac	Evaluation	Ougations	2120
Scudenc	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescroill	аттс

		Frequencies						Instr	uctor	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	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.50	4.30	4.10	4.17	5.00	

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

Course-Section: PHYS 481 1 University of Maryland Title Tech Theoretical Phys Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: McCann, Kevin J

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Grad.

2

3.50-4.00

1

F

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

0

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1131

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	2	1	1	4.29	839/1447	4.29	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	824/1447	4.29	4.47	4.27	4.43	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	- ,	4.14	4.50	4.33	4.41	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	2	2		1322/1402	3.29	4.39	4.24	4.34	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	1		1212/1358	3.40	4.38	4.11	4.15	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	1		1050/1316	3.67	4.47	4.14	4.27	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	2		1180/1427	3.71	4.42	4.19	4.20	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.30	4.10	4.17	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Т	U	U	U	Τ	2	3	4.33	340/1434	4.33	4.30	4.10	4.1/	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.87	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	478/1193	4.25	4.32	4.02	4.00	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.49	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.51	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	4	Graduate	9	2	Majo	or	5
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4			_			-								
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-gr	rad	5	Non-	major	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0									3				-	

Electives

Other

2

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 499	18	University of Maryland	Page 1132
Title Senior Re	search - Hono	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Hoff,Raym	ond M	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	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	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.31	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.30	4.10	4.17	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	4.78	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.80	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.59	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.55	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.43	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	<u> </u>
00.07										- 				

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

Course-Section: PHYS 607 01 University of Maryland Page 1133 Title Electromag Waves/Radia Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Kramer, Ivan

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

		Spring		-
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 															
1 Did voi	u dain ne	ew insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3 70	1277/1447	3.70	4.64	4.31	4.46	3.70
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	2		1053/1447	4.00	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.00
		estions reflect	_		0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	878/1241	4.10	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.10
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	891/1402		4.39	4.24	4.29	4.13
			_	hat you learned	0	2	1	0	3	2	2		1170/1358	3.50	4.38	4.11	4.26	3.50
	_	-		what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	3		719/1316	4.14	4.47	4.14	4.34	4.14
		system clearly		2	0	0	1	0	1	5	3		1077/1427	3.90	4.42	4.19	4.25	3.90
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69		5.00
				ing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	5	1		1003/1434		4.30	4.10		3.88
	100. 5	,		5														
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well r	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1000/1387	4.30	4.64	4.46	4.51	4.30
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1203/1387	4.40	4.87	4.73	4.81	4.40
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1174/1386	3.80	4.38	4.32	4.43	3.80
4. Did the	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clea 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	2	7	0	3.50	1246/1380	3.50	4.46	4.32	4.38	3.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1193	****	4.32	4.02	4.02	****
			_	_														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to v	hat you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1172	***	4.47	4.15	4.32	***
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	l to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.46	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air and	l open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.52	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		8	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	4.52	4.06	4.10	****
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	A 3		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	9	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	5			
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: PHYS 610 01 University of Maryland
Title Quantum Electronics Baltimore County
Instructor: Shih, Yan-hua Spring 2010

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

D 0

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 2

2

University of Maryland Page 1134
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Geneval														
General	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	1/1447	5.00	1 (1	1 21	1 10	5.00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	-	0	0	0	0	1	2	5.00 4.50	532/1447	4.50	$4.64 \\ 4.47$	4.31	4.46	4.50
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	-	0	0	0	0	1	2		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	•	•	0	•	Τ	Ţ	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.30	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.64	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.38	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.46	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	0		1087/1193		4.32	4.02	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172		4.47	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.55	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170		4.50	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.52	4.06	4.10	4.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ıt.i.or	n									
	2				=									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Rec	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 r	2
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			_			-						3 -		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	major	0

Electives

Other

Course-Section: PHYS 622 01 University of Maryland Page 1135
Title Atmos Physics II Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Atmos Physics II Baltimore County
Instructor: McMillan, Willia Martins, Jose V. (Instr. A) Spring 2010

Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Elea			_		T10 01		Q	Damb	TIMDO	T 1	Go est
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	cies 3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.64	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	782/1241	4.25	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.39	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.38	4.11	4.26	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.47	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.42	4.19	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.85	4.69	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1434	3.83	4.30	4.10	4.21	3.83

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1387	4.75	4.64	4.46	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1386	4.13	4.38	4.32	4.43	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	659/1380	4.25	4.46	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	288/1193	4.75	4.32	4.02	4.02	4.75

Discussion

 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.47	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.55	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.50	4.38	4.52	4.00

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

Course-Section: PHYS 622 01 University of Maryland Page 1136
Title Atmos Physics II Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	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	Λ	Λ	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.64	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1		782/1241		4.50	4.33	4.38	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	766/1402		4.39	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	237/1358		4.38	4.11	4.26	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne		1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.47	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.42	4.19	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		836/1447	4.75	4.85	4.69	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434		4.30	4.10	4.21	
		-	-	-		_	-		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.75	4.64	4.46	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.13	4.38	4.32	4.43	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1030/1380	4.25	4.46	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	4.75	4.32	4.02	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.47	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.55	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.50	4.38	4.52	4.00
Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credita Farned Cum CDA Francted Crede	a			D.O.	agon	~			Тъ п	20			Majora	

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

Course-Section: PHYS 632 01 University of Maryland Title

The Physics Of Astrop Baltimore County Instructor: Henriksen, Mark Spring 2010

? 0

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1137

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fr	equei	ncies	;		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 n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.64	4.31	4.46	4.20
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.20
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.60
	_	uations reflect		1 0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	280/1358	4.60	4.38	4.11	4.26	4.60
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.47	4.14	4.34	4.00
		g system clearl		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.42	4.19	4.25	4.60
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1088/1434	3.75	4.30	4.10	4.21	3.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1085/1387	4.20	4.64	4.46	4.51	4.20
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00	
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.38	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.46	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.32	4.02	4.02	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1172	****	4.47	4.15	4.32	****
2. Were a	ill stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.55	4.35	4.46	***
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.50	4.38	4.52	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	.			Ту	pe			Majors	;
		0.00-0.99	0											- 				
00-27	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	3	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	5		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_					_					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	0 3	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 1	D 0														_
Grad.	F 0		El€	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	ſh			
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			
			I 0		Oth	ner					0							

Course-Section: PHYS 640 01 University of Maryland Page 1138
Title Computational Physics Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Lary, David J

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

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	1	0	2	6	4.44	667/1447	4.44	4.64	4.31	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected of	goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1447	4.78	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected	goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected of		0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.39	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you		0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22		4.22	4.38	4.11	4.26	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what y	you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.86	4.47	4.14	4.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	2	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.42	4.19	4.25	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	5	4		1124/1447	4.44	4.85	4.69	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching eff	fectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	634/1434	4.25	4.30	4.10	4.21	4.25
Legture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	٩	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4 64	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the su		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87		4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.89	4.38	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you lear		0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.46	4.32	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unde	erstanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.32	4.02	4.02	4.67
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you		4	0	0	0	0	4	1		619/1172	4.20	4.47	4.15	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to par		5	0	0	0	1	1			737/1182	4.25	4.55	4.35	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open of 4. Were special techniques successful	ilscussion	5 5	0 2	0	0	0	1 2	3	4.75	390/1170 ****/ 800	4.75	4.50 4.52	4.38 4.06	4.52 4.10	4.75 ****
4. Were special techniques successful		5	۷	U	U	U	۷	U	4.00	/ 800		4.52	4.00	4.10	
	Frequ	iency	Dis	cribu	ution	n									
					_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Exped	cted Grades				Rea	asons	3			Тур	e 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	S	7	Graduate	2	5	Majo	r	4
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 H	3 0			-			,								
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-gr	ad	4	Non-	major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 I	0 0														
Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 2	ਦ 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
I	-									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	it	
]			Otl	ner					0						
1	? 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 650 08
Title Special Topics
Instructor: George,Ian M

2

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1139 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionn:	aire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionna	オエエヒ

Ouestions	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5						5		structor Course Dept n Rank Mean Mear				Level Mean	
Quescions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.30	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture	0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 7													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared									798/1387			4.46	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0 0 0 0 0 0 2								1/1387	5.00		4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0		2		1/1386	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2				4.46	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.32	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion		_		_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1		0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1172				4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1		0	0	0	0		5.00			4.55	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.50	4.38	4.52	5.00
Freq	ionat	, Dist	+rih	ut i o	2									
rieq	uency	DIS	CLID	ucio.	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2	Required for Majors 0							0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	Required for hajors										_			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0	General 0					0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0		
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0	Electives					2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh		
Р 0							respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t			
I 0	Other					0								
? 0	Ocuer													

Course-Section: PHYS 698 01
Title Physics Seminar
Instructor: Franson, James D

16

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1140 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.64	4.31	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1264/1402	3.50	4.39	4.24	4.29	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.47	4.14	4.34	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.30	4.10	4.21	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	55/ 66	4.33	4.78	4.58	4.71	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.64	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.50	4.09	4.18	***

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

Course-Section: PHYS 701 01 University of Maryland Baltimore County Quantum Mechanics II

Title Instructor: Franson, James D Spring 2010 Enrollment: 5

В

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

1

0

0

0

0

0

0

Questionnaires: 5		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-------------------	--	---------	--------	------------	---------------

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

0

1

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

1

	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain n	ew insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.64	4.31	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instru	ctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam q	uestions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.60
4. Did other eval	uations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.39	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned r	eadings contribute to what you learned	. 0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.38	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written as	signments contribute to what you learn	ed 0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.47	4.14	4.34	4.25
7. Was the grading	g system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.42	4.19	4.25	4.60
8. How many times	was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.85	4.69	4.74	4.40
9. How would you	ss 1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.30	4.10	4.21	4.50	
1. Were the instr	uctor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.64	4.46	4.51	5.00
	ctor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
	terial presented and explained clearly	. 0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	748/1386	4.40	4.38	4.32	4.43	4.40
	es contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.46	4.32	4.38	4.80
	l techniques enhance your understandin	g 0	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.00		4.02	4.02	3.00
	equency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grad	les	Rea							Typ	e			Majors	;
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	ajor:	 s	5	Graduate	: :	1	Majo		5

General

Other

Electives

Frequencies

Instructor

0

0

0

Under-grad

4

responses to be significant

- Means there are not enough

Page 1141

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Non-major

University of Maryland Baltimore County

0

0 0 0 0 0 3

0 0

Spring 2010

Enrollment:	3
Omestienneimes:	2

Title

Instructor:

Course-Section: PHYS 722 01

Atmos Remote Sens Chiu,Jui-Yuan

Page 1142 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

5.00

1/1316 5.00 4.47 4.14 4.34

1/1447 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.74 5.00

0 4.00 971/1427 4.00 4.42 4.19 4.25 4.00

1 4.50 341/1434 4.50 4.30 4.10 4.21 4.50

Questionnaires: 3 Student Co	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire													
			Fre	equei	ncies	5	uctor	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	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.26	5.00

0 0 0 0 3

0

0 0 0 5.00

3 5.00

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness

6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned

7. Was the grading system clearly explained

8. How many times was class cancelled

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.64	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.38	4.32	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.46	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.32	4.02	4.02	4.67

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.47	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.55	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.50	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.52	4.06	4.10	5.00

Seminar

Bellinar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	66	5.00	4.78	4.58	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	58	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.75	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.64	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	36/	64	4.00	4.50	4.09	4.18	4.00

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

Course-Section: PHYS 898 08 University of Maryland Title Pre Candidacy Doc Rsch Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: George, Ian M

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1143

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Instr	uctor	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	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.69	4.47	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.67	4.30	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.64	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.46	4.32	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.47	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.55	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.50	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.52	4.06	4.10	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
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	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 898 10 University of Maryland Title Pre Candidacy Doc Rsch

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1144

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Shih,Yan-hua

Instructor:

						_		T10 01		G	Domb	IMDO	T 1	0
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	equei	ncies	3 4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions								Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.69	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.29	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.34	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.47	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.55	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.50	4.38	4.52	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.21	4.34	4.82	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.79	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	160/ 186	4.00	4.38	4.48	4.73	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 187	5.00	4.46	4.33	4.67	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.85	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 31		4.50	4.64	4.59	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: PHYS 898 16

Pre Candidacy Doc Rsch

Title Martins,Jose V Instructor:

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1145 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluati	on Quest	ionna:	ire
---------	--------	----------	----------	--------	-----

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.46	г оо
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.69	4.64	4.31	4.46	5.00 4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	4.67	4.30	4.10	4.21	5.00
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.64	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.46	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.32	4.02	4.02	5.00
_, ,														
Discussion			•			•	_		4 /4 4 5 0				4 00	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172		4.47	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.55	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.50	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.52	4.06	4.10	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.85	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 21	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.65	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31		4.50	4.64	4.59	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20		5.00	4.60	4.56	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 15	4.00	4.00	4.61	4.80	4.00
									-,					

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

Course-Section	n: PHYS 898 18	University of Maryland	Page 1146
Title	Pre Candidacy Doc Rsch	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Hoff, Raymond M	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1			_			
Ouestionnaires:	1	St.udent.	Course	Eval	uation	Ouestionr	naire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5				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	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.69	4.47	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.38	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.47	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.67	4.30	4.10	4.21	4.00

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

Course-Section: PHYS 898 22 Title Pre Candidacy Doc Rsch

Georganopoulos, 2 Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 2 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1147 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	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	0	_			
				?	0						