```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1454
Title          INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S         Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    JACOBS, JUSTIN                 Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires: 35                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  1  4  5 24  4.53  582/1522  3.92  4.36  4.30  4.14  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  4 28  4.76  244/1522  4.19  4.39  4.26  4.18  4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  1  4 28  4.82  220/1285  4.30  4.50  4.30  4.22  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  17  0  0  1  3 12  4.69  295/1476  4.14  4.37  4.22  4.09  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  9  4  1  2  5 13  3.88  908/1412  3.61  4.07  4.06  4.01  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 19  0  1  1  2 11  4.53  305/1381  3.69  4.16  4.08  3.93  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  2 30  4.82  149/1500  3.99  4.43  4.18  4.16  4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 10 24  4.71  891/1517  4.84  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1  0  1  3  5 17  4.46  433/1497  3.79  4.23  4.11  4.02  4.46

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  2 31  4.88  224/1440  4.48  4.66  4.45  4.40  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  2 31  4.88  548/1448  4.56  4.68  4.71  4.63  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  1  1  2 28  4.78  248/1436  4.11  4.42  4.29  4.24  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  2  0  1 30  4.68  442/1432  4.08  4.43  4.29  4.23  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 19  2  0  1  0  8  4.09  575/1221  3.57  3.64  3.93  3.86  4.09

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  6  1  5  3 13  3.57 1000/1280  3.54  3.74  4.10  3.92  3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  2  1  5  3 17  4.14  879/1277  3.55  3.90  4.34  4.13  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  1  2  6  3 16  4.11  853/1269  3.76  4.04  4.31  4.04  4.11
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  17  2  0  5  1  2  3.10  771/ 854  2.92  3.74  4.02  3.87  3.10

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  28  1  1  0  2  1  2  3.50 ****/ 215  ****  5.00  4.36  4.31  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 1  0  2  1  1  3.20 ****/ 228  5.00  5.00  4.35  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 1 0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/ 217  ****  5.00  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           30  1  0  0  3  0  1  3.50 ****/ 216  5.00  5.00  4.42  4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30  1  0  1  2  0  1  3.25 ****/ 205  ****  5.00  4.23  4.28  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 32 0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  79  ****  4.95  4.58  4.13  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 33 0 0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  77  ****  5.00  4.52  4.03  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  5.00  4.49  3.85  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    33  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  78  ****  4.95  4.45  3.88  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                33  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.48  4.11  3.79  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  3.90  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  3.90  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       33  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.40  3.99  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   33  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.31  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  34  ****  5.00  4.30  4.11  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    33  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  5.00  4.41  4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      33  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.69  4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       33  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  22  ****  5.00  4.54  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     33  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  18  ****  5.00  4.49  4.11  ****
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0101            University of Maryland
Title           INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S      Baltimore County
Instructor:     JACOBS, JUSTIN              Spring 2007
Enrollment:      35
Questionnaires:  35              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0102            University of Maryland                                    Page 1455
Title      INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S          Baltimore County                                        JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   JACOBS, JUSTIN               Spring 2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires:   5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1522	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.19	4.39	4.26	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	278/1285	4.30	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.14	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1302/1412	3.61	4.07	4.06	4.01	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1381	3.69	4.16	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	3.99	4.43	4.18	4.16	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.84	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1497	3.79	4.23	4.11	4.02	5.00

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.48	4.66	4.45	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.56	4.68	4.71	4.63	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.11	4.42	4.29	4.24	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.08	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.86	****

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1106/1280	3.54	3.74	4.10	3.92	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1094/1277	3.55	3.90	4.34	4.13	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	721/1269	3.76	4.04	4.31	4.04	4.33

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.28	****

Field Work

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****

Self Paced

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0201              University of Maryland                                    Page 1456
Title       INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S          Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    ABERCROMBIE, MA              Spring 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 21                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  2   5   5   5   4  3.19 1472/1522  3.92  4.36   4.30 4.14  3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2   2   6   8   3  3.38 1408/1522  4.19  4.39   4.26 4.18  3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  2   0   5  10   4  3.67 1123/1285  4.30  4.50   4.30 4.22  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  3   1   7   7   3  3.29 1374/1476  4.14  4.37   4.22 4.09  3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  3  3  0   2   8   4  3.59 1122/1412  3.61  4.07   4.06 4.01  3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  3  1  4  10   2  3.35 1219/1381  3.69  4.16   4.08 3.93  3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  6   5   3   4   2  2.55 1469/1500  3.99  4.43   4.18 4.16  2.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0   0   0   4  17  4.81  714/1517  4.84  4.75   4.65 4.62  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  10  1  2  2  3  3   0  2.70 1466/1497  3.79  4.23   4.11 4.02  2.70


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0  1   1   4   7   5  3.78 1297/1440  4.48  4.66   4.45 4.40  3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0  1   2   1   8   6  3.89 1387/1448  4.56  4.68   4.71 4.63  3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4  0  3  1  6   5   2  3.12 1371/1436  4.11  4.42   4.29 4.24  3.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  5   1   4   7   1  2.89 1383/1432  4.08  4.43   4.29 4.23  2.89

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  5  7  2  1  3   3   0  2.78 1128/1221  3.57  3.64   3.93 3.86  2.78


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2  0  5  1  5   3   5  3.11 1178/1280  3.54  3.74   4.10 3.92  3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2  0  3  2  7   3   4  3.16 1203/1277  3.55  3.90   4.34 4.13  3.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2  0  5  3  3   4   4  2.95 1221/1269  3.76  4.04   4.31 4.04  2.95
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   6  1   0   3   6   2  3.67  625/ 854  2.92  3.74   4.02 3.87  3.67


                   Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  5.00   4.36 4.31  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 228  5.00  5.00   4.35 4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 217  ****  5.00   4.51 4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 216  5.00  5.00   4.42 4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 205  ****  5.00   4.23 4.28  ****


                   Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  4.95   4.58 4.13  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  5.00   4.52 4.03  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  65  ****  5.00   4.49 3.85  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  4.95   4.45 3.88  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.48   4.11 3.79  ****


                   Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00   4.41 3.90  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  5.00   4.30 3.90  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00   4.40 3.99  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00   4.31 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  34  ****  5.00   4.30 4.11  ****


                   Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  20  0  0  0  0   1   0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00   4.63 4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  23  ****  5.00   4.41 4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00   4.69 4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  22  ****  5.00   4.54 4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    20   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  18  ****  5.00   4.49 4.11  ****
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0201              University of Maryland              Page 1456
Title         INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S         Baltimore County                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   ABERCROMBIE, MA                 Spring 2007                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      35
Questionnaires:  21                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0202                    University of Maryland                           Page 1457
Title         INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S               Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   ABERCROMBIE, MA                      Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      32
Questionnaires:  21                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  2  4  8  4  3  3.10 1481/1522   3.92  4.36  4.30  4.14  3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  3  9  5  3  3.29 1432/1522   4.19  4.39  4.26  4.18  3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  2  2  6  3  8  3.62 1138/1285   4.30  4.50  4.30  4.22  3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  2  3  7  2  5  3.26 1378/1476   4.14  4.37  4.22  4.09  3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 2 1 6 2 8  3.68 1065/1412   3.61  4.07  4.06  4.01  3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 5 4 5 3 4  2.86 1323/1381   3.69  4.16  4.08  3.93  2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  2  2  7  5  5  3.43 1345/1500   3.99  4.43  4.18  4.16  3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86  600/1517   4.84  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1 2 6 6 1  3.25 1370/1497   3.79  4.23  4.11  4.02  3.25


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  1  2  4  5  8  3.85 1269/1440   4.48  4.66  4.45  4.40  3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  2  3  4 11  4.20 1319/1448   4.56  4.68  4.71  4.63  4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 3 6 2 3 6  3.15 1365/1436   4.11  4.42  4.29  4.24  3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  4  2  5  3  6  3.25 1335/1432   4.08  4.43  4.29  4.23  3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 2 4 2 1 1  2.50 1165/1221   3.57  3.64  3.93  3.86  2.50


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 5 3 6 3  3.05 1182/1280   3.54  3.74  4.10  3.92  3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 5 5 5 5  3.50 1136/1277   3.55  3.90  4.34  4.13  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 3 7 3 6  3.50 1117/1269   3.76  4.04  4.31  4.04  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  7  2  1  3  2  4  3.42  701/ 854   2.92  3.74  4.02  3.87  3.42


                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19  0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 215   ****  5.00  4.36  4.31  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 1 0 1 0 0  2.00 ****/ 228   5.00  5.00  4.35  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 217   ****  5.00  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          20  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 216   5.00  5.00  4.42  4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 205   ****  5.00  4.23  4.28  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4      0.00-0.99   0        A    2      Required for Majors  11    Graduate     0     Major        0
 28-55      4      1.00-1.99   3        B    7                                 Under-grad  21     Non-major   21
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   6        C    5      General               1    Under-grad  21     Non-major   21
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49   3        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1        F    1      Electives             3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 9
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0301          University of Maryland                              Page 1458
Title       INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S         Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  KHALATBARI, FAR               Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires:  14                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  3  1  8  4.00 1122/1522  3.92  4.36  4.30  4.14  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  3  2  8  4.14  986/1522  4.19  4.39  4.26  4.18  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  1  2 10  4.43  626/1285  4.30  4.50  4.30  4.22  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  0  0  2  3  5  4.30  735/1476  4.14  4.37  4.22  4.09  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  1  0  1  2  5  3.73 1037/1412  3.61  4.07  4.06  4.01  3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  1  1  2  3  5  3.83  992/1381  3.69  4.16  4.08  3.93  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  3  1  1  8  4.08  950/1500  3.99  4.43  4.18  4.16  4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1517  4.84  4.75  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  1  6  3  3  3.62 1233/1497  3.79  4.23  4.11  4.02  3.62


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  2  2 10  4.57  716/1440  4.48  4.66  4.45  4.40  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  629/1448  4.56  4.68  4.71  4.63  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  2  1  3  8  4.21  916/1436  4.11  4.42  4.29  4.24  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  0  4  9  4.43  732/1432  4.08  4.43  4.29  4.23  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  3  1  9  4.46  311/1221  3.57  3.64  3.93  3.86  4.46


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  0  0  2  8  4.17  644/1280  3.54  3.74  4.10  3.92  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  2  1  2  6  3.83 1038/1277  3.55  3.90  4.34  4.13  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  1  2  2  7  4.25  777/1269  3.76  4.04  4.31  4.04  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   9  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 854  2.92  3.74  4.02  3.87  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons              Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A   10    Required for Majors  4      Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55      5      1.00-1.99   0      B    3

 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   1      C    0     General             1      Under-grad  14      Non-major  14
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49   2      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2      F    0     Electives           0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                              responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other             6
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0302              University of Maryland                          Page 1459
Title        INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S         Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  KEGAN, BONNIE E                Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  2  3  3  4.13 1033/1522  3.92  4.36  4.30  4.14  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  255/1522  4.19  4.39  4.26  4.18  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  1  0  1  6  4.50  531/1285  4.30  4.50  4.30  4.22  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  316/1476  4.14  4.37  4.22  4.09  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  2  0  4  1  3.57 1127/1412  3.61  4.07  4.06  4.01  3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  2  0  2  3  3.86  977/1381  3.69  4.16  4.08  3.93  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  780/1500  3.99  4.43  4.18  4.16  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  555/1517  4.84  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  3  3  1  3.71 1174/1497  3.79  4.23  4.11  4.02  3.71

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1440  4.48  4.66  4.45  4.40  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  935/1448  4.56  4.68  4.71  4.63  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  514/1436  4.11  4.42  4.29  4.24  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  732/1432  4.08  4.43  4.29  4.23  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0  0  1  2  1  4.00  606/1221  3.57  3.64  3.93  3.86  4.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  1  2  3  4.00  718/1280  3.54  3.74  4.10  3.92  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  2  1  1  1  2  3.00 1214/1277  3.55  3.90  4.34  4.13  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1  1  1  2  2  3.43 1138/1269  3.76  4.04  4.31  4.04  3.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  5  1  1  0  0  0  1.50  852/ 854  2.92  3.74  4.02  3.87  1.50


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0        A    4         Required for Majors  3    Graduate      0    Major        0
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99   0        B    2
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99   3        C    0         General              0    Under-grad    8    Non-major    8
  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 be significant
                                         I    0         Other                4
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1460
Title          STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI        Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    SLOWIKOWSKI, WI               Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires: 23                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5   Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0 15  8  4.35  802/1522   4.21  4.36  4.30  4.34  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0 12 11  4.48  592/1522   4.42  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0 10 13  4.57  467/1285   4.41  4.50  4.30  4.30  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   4  0  0  4  8  7  4.16  903/1476   4.18  4.37  4.22  4.26  4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5  1  3  4  6  4  3.50 1165/1412   3.62  4.07  4.06  4.03  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 0  2  5  2  4.00  806/1381   3.68  4.16  4.08  4.13  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  3  8 11  4.26  770/1500   4.38  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  3 19  4.86  577/1517   4.79  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0  1  8  9  4.44  457/1497   4.09  4.23  4.11  4.13  4.44

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  8 15  4.65  617/1440   4.58  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  1  7 14  4.59 1080/1448   4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  2  8 13  4.48  636/1436   4.33  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  5 18  4.78  316/1432   4.49  4.43  4.29  4.29  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 15 3 1 0 3  1  2.75 1133/1221   3.52  3.64  3.93  3.94  2.75

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  3  3  5  8  2  3.14 1166/1280   3.40  3.74  4.10  4.14  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  2  5  8  3  3  3.00 1214/1277   3.41  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 4 4  6  3  4  2.95 1219/1269   3.57  4.04  4.31  4.39  2.95
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  19  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 854   4.01  3.74  4.02  4.00  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 228   ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
```

                         Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A  13      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55      5      1.00-1.99   1      B   6
56-83      6      2.00-2.99   1      C   2      General              0    Under-grad  23      Non-major  23
84-150     6      3.00-3.49   9      D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                               responses to be significant
                                     I   0      Other               19
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0102                  University of Maryland                              Page 1461
Title           STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI          Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:     SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                 Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     37
Questionnaires: 29                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                    General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  3 16 10  4.24   909/1522   4.21   4.36  4.30 4.34  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4 10 15  4.38   738/1522   4.42   4.39  4.26 4.25  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  5  6 18  4.45   602/1285   4.41   4.50  4.30 4.30  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  5  0  2  5  8  9  4.00  1009/1476   4.18   4.37  4.22 4.26  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  2  3 10  8  4  3.33  1257/1412   3.62   4.07  4.06 4.03  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12 4  2  5  3  3  2.94  1304/1381   3.68   4.16  4.08 4.13  2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  2  8 18  4.48   512/1500   4.38   4.43  4.18 4.13  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 29  5.00     1/1517   4.79   4.75  4.65 4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0  3  9 12  4.38   534/1497   4.09   4.23  4.11 4.13  4.38

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  1  9 18  4.61   682/1440   4.58   4.66  4.45 4.46  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  1  8 19  4.64  1024/1448   4.51   4.68  4.71 4.71  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  1  1 12 14  4.39   730/1436   4.33   4.42  4.29 4.30  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  1  8 19  4.64   478/1432   4.49   4.43  4.29 4.29  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 23 0 1 2  0  2  3.60  ****/1221   3.52   3.64  3.93 3.94  ****

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  5  3  8  6  3  2.96  1202/1280   3.40   3.74  4.10 4.14  2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0  4  4 10  2  5  3.00  1214/1277   3.41   3.90  4.34 4.38  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5  3  8  3  6  3.08  1205/1269   3.57   4.04  4.31 4.39  3.08
4. Were special techniques successful                 4 19  1  2  1  0  2  3.00  ****/ 854   4.01   3.74  4.02 4.00  ****

                    Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 215   ****   5.00  4.36 4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0 1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 228   ****   5.00  4.35 4.29  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          28  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 216   ****   5.00  4.42 4.35  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0       A   14      Required for Majors  0    Graduate       0      Major        0
28-55     7      1.00-1.99    0       B   11
56-83     6      2.00-2.99    4       C    1      General              1    Under-grad    29      Non-major   29

84-150    3      3.00-3.49    6       D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    6       F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               26
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1462
Title       STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI          Baltimore County                                    JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA                 Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires: 24                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  2  2  7  8  5  3.50 1402/1522  4.21  4.36  4.30  4.34  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  6  8  9  4.04 1058/1522  4.42  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  4  4  8  8  3.83 1053/1285  4.41  4.50  4.30  4.30  3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  1  2  6  6  8  3.78 1183/1476  4.18  4.37  4.22  4.26  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  2  3  5  3  7  3.50 1165/1412  3.62  4.07  4.06  4.03  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  3  7  6  5  3.62 1124/1381  3.68  4.16  4.08  4.13  3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  2  7  8  7  3.83 1129/1500  4.38  4.43  4.18  4.13  3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  5 18  4.78  749/1517  4.79  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 2 2 12 4  0  2.90 1438/1497  4.09  4.23  4.11  4.13  2.90

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  2  4  5 12  4.17 1106/1440  4.58  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  1  6  7  9  4.04 1348/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  1  2  7  9  4  3.57 1269/1436  4.33  4.42  4.29  4.30  3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  2  2  1  5  5  8  3.76 1186/1432  4.49  4.43  4.29  4.29  3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 4 0  2  0  7  3.46  921/1221  3.52  3.64  3.93  3.94  3.46

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  3  3  3  5  3  3.12 1175/1280  3.40  3.74  4.10  4.14  3.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  3  3  5  3  3  3.00 1214/1277  3.41  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 1  1  5  4  4  3.60 1097/1269  3.57  4.04  4.31  4.39  3.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  7 13  1  1  1  0  1  2.75 ****/ 854  4.01  3.74  4.02  4.00  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 22  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 215  ****  5.00  4.36  4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0 1 0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 217  ****  5.00  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          22  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 216  ****  5.00  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 205  ****  5.00  4.23  4.26  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.95  4.58  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  5.00  4.52  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  5.00  4.49  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.95  4.45  4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.48  4.11  3.33  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.40  4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.31  4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  5.00  4.30  4.12  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  5.00  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.69  4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  5.00  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  5.00  4.49  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0202                   University of Maryland                              Page 1463
Title        STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI              Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  ABERCROMBIE, MA                     Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 25                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  4  1  8 12  4.12 1033/1522  4.21  4.36  4.30 4.34  4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  0  6 11  7  3.92 1168/1522  4.42  4.39  4.26 4.25  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  3  9 11  4.16  833/1285  4.41  4.50  4.30 4.30  4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  3  0  0  5  7 10  4.23  827/1476  4.18  4.37  4.22 4.26  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  1  2  1  9  9  4.05  734/1412  3.62  4.07  4.06 4.03  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4 1 0 4 6 8  4.05  779/1381  3.68  4.16  4.08 4.13  4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  2  3  6 14  4.28  750/1500  4.38  4.43  4.18 4.13  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  0  0  4 19  4.83  668/1517  4.79  4.75  4.65 4.62  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 2 7 9 2  3.55 1258/1497  4.09  4.23  4.11 4.13  3.55

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  2  1  6 14  4.39  938/1440  4.58  4.66  4.45 4.46  4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  2  2 10  9  4.13 1334/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71 4.71  4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 3 11 7  3.96 1107/1436  4.33  4.42  4.29 4.30  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  1  1  3  8 10  4.09 1000/1432  4.49  4.43  4.29 4.29  4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 2 3 3 4 4  3.31  991/1221  3.52  3.64  3.93 3.94  3.31

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  5  2  4  2  6  3.11 1178/1280  3.40  3.74  4.10 4.14  3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  5  1  7  0  6  3.05 1211/1277  3.41  3.90  4.34 4.38  3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 3 4 4 2 6  3.21 1184/1269  3.57  4.04  4.31 4.39  3.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  6 11  1  1  1  0  5  3.88  538/ 854  4.01  3.74  4.02 4.00  3.88

            Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 1 0 0 0  2.00 ****/ 217  ****  5.00  4.51 4.45  ****

            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  77  ****  5.00  4.52 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  24 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  65  ****  5.00  4.49 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  78  ****  4.95  4.45 4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  80  ****  4.48  4.11 3.33  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     3        0.00-0.99   0      A   16       Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major       1
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0      B    6
  56-83     4        2.00-2.99   3      C    1       General              2      Under-grad  25      Non-major  24
  84-150    7        3.00-3.49   7      D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   3      F    0       Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               20
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0301              University of Maryland                           Page 1464
Title          STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI       Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    SLOWIKOWSKI, WI              Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires: 19                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
             Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  3  3 13  4.53  582/1522  4.21  4.36  4.30  4.34  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  135/1522  4.42  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  0  0  2 16  4.89  165/1285  4.41  4.50  4.30  4.30  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  4  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  316/1476  4.18  4.37  4.22  4.26  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  1  3  4  6  4.07  715/1412  3.62  4.07  4.06  4.03  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  272/1381  3.68  4.16  4.08  4.13  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  1  0  0  0  1 17  4.94   65/1500  4.38  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  855/1517  4.79  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  164/1497  4.09  4.23  4.11  4.13  4.79

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  208/1440  4.58  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1 18  4.95  296/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3 16  4.84  179/1436  4.33  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  2  0  0  1  1 15  4.82  267/1432  4.49  4.43  4.29  4.29  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  232/1221  3.52  3.64  3.93  3.94  4.57

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  3  5  9  4.05  701/1280  3.40  3.74  4.10  4.14  4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  3  5 11  4.42  672/1277  3.41  3.90  4.34  4.38  4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  1  3  4 11  4.32  735/1269  3.57  4.04  4.31  4.39  4.32
4. Were special techniques successful                  0 11  0  1  1  3  3  4.00  426/ 854  4.01  3.74  4.02  4.00  4.00

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  5.00  4.36  4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  5.00  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  5.00  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  5.00  4.23  4.26  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  4.39  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  5.00  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0      A   14       Required for Majors   1   Graduate     1    Major       0
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99   0      B    4
 56-83     7      2.00-2.99   1      C    1       General               0   Under-grad  18    Non-major  19
 84-150    6      3.00-3.49   5      D    0
 Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   4      F    0       Electives             1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                     I    0       Other                15
                                     ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0302              University of Maryland                                    Page 1465
Title           STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI      Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:     SLOWIKOWSKI, WI             Spring 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 19                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   1   7  11  4.53   582/1522  4.21  4.36  4.30  4.34  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   4  15  4.79   222/1522  4.42  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   8  11  4.58   456/1285  4.41  4.50  4.30  4.30  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2   0   0   2   9   6  4.24   815/1476  4.18  4.37  4.22  4.26  4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   2   1   5   5   2  3.27  1284/1412  3.62  4.07  4.06  4.03  3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11  2   1   1   4   0  2.88  1320/1381  3.68  4.16  4.08  4.13  2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   2   6  11  4.47   527/1500  4.38  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   9  10  4.53  1062/1517  4.79  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   0   0   0   9   9  4.50   385/1497  4.09  4.23  4.11  4.13  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   4  15  4.79   392/1440  4.58  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68   977/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   5  14  4.74   326/1436  4.33  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84   240/1432  4.49  4.43  4.29  4.29  4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 15 1   0   0   2   1  3.50  ****/1221  3.52  3.64  3.93  3.94  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0   1   0   3   7   6  4.00   718/1280  3.40  3.74  4.10  4.14  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0   1   1   2   6   7  4.00   930/1277  3.41  3.90  4.34  4.38  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   4   5   8  4.24   791/1269  3.57  4.04  4.31  4.39  4.24
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  10   0   0   0   6   1  4.14   391/ 854  4.01  3.74  4.02  4.00  4.14


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     3       0.00-0.99    2         A    7        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55     2       1.00-1.99    0         B    8
  56-83     3       2.00-2.99    0         C    3        General              2    Under-grad   19      Non-major   19
  84-150    5       3.00-3.49    6         D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3         F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other               17
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 351  0101                 University of Maryland                                   Page 1466
Title      APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO              Baltimore County                                        JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   DASGUPTA, NANDI                  Spring 2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    42
Questionnaires: 31                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0  0  0  2 11 14  4.44  681/1522   4.31  4.36  4.30 4.34  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5   0  0  1  2  8 15  4.42  670/1522   4.33  4.39  4.26 4.25  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   0  0  0  3  7 16  4.50  531/1285   4.44  4.50  4.30 4.30  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5   6  0  0  3  7 10  4.35  682/1476   4.22  4.37  4.22 4.26  4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  5  0  0  3  5 13  4.48  366/1412   4.25  4.07  4.06 4.03  4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 7 0 0 4 10 6  4.10  753/1381   3.96  4.16  4.08 4.13  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0  0  0  3  7 16  4.50  483/1500   4.43  4.43  4.18 4.13  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   0  0  1  0 18  7  4.19 1301/1517   4.56  4.75  4.65 4.62  4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 1 1 0 0 4 9  4.43  481/1497   4.21  4.23  4.11 4.13  4.43

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0  0  0  1  8 16  4.60  682/1440   4.64  4.66  4.45 4.46  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0  0  0  1  3 21  4.80  765/1448   4.72  4.68  4.71 4.71  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  0  2  6 16  4.58  502/1436   4.33  4.42  4.29 4.30  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0  0  0  2  6 16  4.58  548/1432   4.41  4.43  4.29 4.29  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 11 1 2 0 2 6  3.91  695/1221   3.89  3.64  3.93 3.94  3.91

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 3 2 4 5 7  3.52 1022/1280   3.34  3.74  4.10 4.14  3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 2 1 5 4 8  3.75 1066/1277   3.61  3.90  4.34 4.38  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 2 0 4 6 9  3.95  917/1269   3.78  4.04  4.31 4.39  3.95
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  11  2  1  2  3  1  3.00  779/ 854   3.27  3.74  4.02 4.00  3.00

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24  2  1  0  1  1  2  3.60 ****/ 215   ****  5.00  4.36 4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 1 0 1 2 2  3.67 ****/ 228   ****  5.00  4.35 4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 1 0 0 2 0 2  4.00 ****/ 217   ****  5.00  4.51 4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26  1  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/ 216   ****  5.00  4.42 4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26  1  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/ 205   ****  5.00  4.23 4.26  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0 0 0 2 1 2  4.00 ****/  79   ****  4.95  4.58 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 1 0 0 1 1 2  4.25 ****/  77   ****  5.00  4.52 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26 1 0 0 2 0 2  4.00 ****/  65   ****  5.00  4.49 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26  0  0  2  0  1  2  3.60 ****/  78   ****  4.95  4.45 4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26  0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 ****/  80   ****  4.48  4.11 3.33  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 1 2 2  4.20 ****/  47   ****  5.00  4.41 4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 1 2 2  4.20 ****/  45   ****  5.00  4.30 4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26  1  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  39   ****  5.00  4.40 4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26  0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00 ****/  35   ****  5.00  4.31 4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26  1  0  2  0  0  2  3.50 ****/  34   ****  5.00  4.30 4.12  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 1 2 2  4.20 ****/  37   ****  5.00  4.63 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26  1  0  2  0  0  2  3.50 ****/  23   ****  5.00  4.41 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26  1  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/  33   ****  5.00  4.69 4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26  1  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/  22   ****  5.00  4.54 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26  1  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/  18   ****  5.00  4.49 ****  ****
```

Title   APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO   Baltimore County   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI   Spring 2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 31   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   2   0.00-0.99   1   A   7   Required for Majors   1   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   4   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
 56-83   3   2.00-2.99   5   C   1   General   1   Under-grad 31   Non-major   31
 84-150   4   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   15
                                         ?   1

```
Course-Section: STAT 351  0102              University of Maryland                           Page 1467
Title       APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO          Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  DASGUPTA, NANDI                Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires: 16                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


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

          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3   2  11  4.50   605/1522  4.31  4.36  4.30  4.34  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   4   2  10  4.38   738/1522  4.33  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   4  10  4.50   531/1285  4.44  4.50  4.30  4.30  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1   0   0   4   1   9  4.36   682/1476  4.22  4.37  4.22  4.26  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4   1   1   0   2   7  4.18   629/1412  4.25  4.07  4.06  4.03  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0   2   3   0   7  4.00   806/1381  3.96  4.16  4.08  4.13  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   4   0  11  4.47   541/1500  4.43  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   1  10   4  4.20  1301/1517  4.56  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   1   2   8  4.64   288/1497  4.21  4.23  4.11  4.13  4.64


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   1  13  4.69   578/1440  4.64  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87   602/1448  4.72  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   1   3  11  4.67   415/1436  4.33  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   1   2  12  4.73   372/1432  4.41  4.43  4.29  4.29  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8  0   0   1   3   3  4.29   442/1221  3.89  3.64  3.93  3.94  4.29


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   4   0   3   3   4  3.21  1146/1280  3.34  3.74  4.10  4.14  3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   1   1   3   1   7  3.92   996/1277  3.61  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  1   0   3   1   7  4.08   857/1269  3.78  4.04  4.31  4.39  4.08
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   8   0   1   2   1   1  3.40   705/ 854  3.27  3.74  4.02  4.00  3.40


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   0   0   2   0   0   0  2.00  ****/ 215  ****  5.00  4.36  4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0   0   2   0   0  3.00  ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/ 217  ****  5.00  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50  ****/ 216  ****  5.00  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  14  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50  ****/ 205  ****  5.00  4.23  4.26  ****


          Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  77  ****  5.00  4.52  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  65  ****  5.00  4.49  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  78  ****  4.95  4.45  4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80  ****  4.48  4.11  3.33  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  4.39  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.31  4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  34  ****  5.00  4.30  4.12  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  23  ****  5.00  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.69  4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  22  ****  5.00  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  18  ****  5.00  4.49  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: STAT 351  0202            University of Maryland                        Page 1468
Title      APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO          Baltimore County                            JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   STANWYCK, ELIZA              Spring 2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires: 21                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  3  2 16  4.62  482/1522  4.31 4.36  4.30 4.34  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86  164/1522  4.33 4.39  4.26 4.25  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4 17  4.81  228/1285  4.44 4.50  4.30 4.30  4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  0  3  2 10  4.47  535/1476  4.22 4.37  4.22 4.26  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  1  0  2  3  9  4.27  557/1412  4.25 4.07  4.06 4.03  4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 1 1  2  3  8  4.07  774/1381  3.96 4.16  4.08 4.13  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  3 17  4.76  201/1500  4.43 4.43  4.18 4.13  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 21  5.00    1/1517  4.56 4.75  4.65 4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0  6  9  4.60  312/1497  4.21 4.23  4.11 4.13  4.60

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1 20  4.95   96/1440  4.64 4.66  4.45 4.46  4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 20  4.95  247/1448  4.72 4.68  4.71 4.71  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  1  0 19  4.71  357/1436  4.33 4.42  4.29 4.30  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  0  2 18  4.71  394/1432  4.41 4.43  4.29 4.29  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 14 1 0  0  1  5  4.29  442/1221  3.89 3.64  3.93 3.94  4.29

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  7  2  2  2  5  2.78 1238/1280  3.34 3.74  4.10 4.14  2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  5  3  1  3  6  3.11 1207/1277  3.61 3.90  4.34 4.38  3.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  4  2  3  2  7  3.33 1156/1269  3.78 4.04  4.31 4.39  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  12  1  0  1  2  2  3.67  625/ 854  3.27 3.74  4.02 4.00  3.67

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  20   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  **** 5.00  4.36 4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 228  **** 5.00  4.35 4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 217  **** 5.00  4.51 4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           20   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 216  **** 5.00  4.42 4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 205  **** 5.00  4.23 4.26  ****

            Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    20   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  78  **** 4.95  4.45 4.34  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  47  **** 5.00  4.41 4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  45  **** 5.00  4.30 4.39  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  **** 5.00  4.63 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  23  **** 5.00  4.41 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  33  **** 5.00  4.69 4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  22  **** 5.00  4.54 ****  ****

                            Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    0       0.00-0.99   0       A  10      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major       0
28-55    0       1.00-1.99   0       B   4
56-83    5       2.00-2.99   3       C   5      General              1     Under-grad   21     Non-major  21
84-150   5       3.00-3.49   4       D   1
Grad.    0       3.50-4.00   2       F   0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other              18
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 351  0301              University of Maryland                              Page 1469
Title      APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO              Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C                      Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires:  22                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  2  7  9  4  3.68 1329/1522  4.31  4.36  4.30  4.34  3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  2  7  9  4  3.68 1296/1522  4.33  4.39  4.26  4.25  3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  1  5 10  6  3.95  982/1285  4.44  4.50  4.30  4.30  3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   6   1  0  4  9  2  3.69 1233/1476  4.22  4.37  4.22  4.26  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10   0  0  2  7  3  4.08  709/1412  4.25  4.07  4.06  4.03  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7   1  3  1  5  5  3.67 1097/1381  3.96  4.16  4.08  4.13  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  3  3  7  9  4.00  988/1500  4.43  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  3 19  4.86  577/1517  4.56  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  2  1  8  6  1  3.17 1395/1497  4.21  4.23  4.11  4.13  3.17

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   1  0  2  7 12  4.32  999/1440  4.64  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   1  0  4  4 13  4.27 1293/1448  4.72  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0   1  3  7  9  2  3.36 1326/1436  4.33  4.42  4.29  4.30  3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   2  2  5  7  6  3.59 1245/1432  4.41  4.43  4.29  4.29  3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 9  1  3  3  4  1  3.08 1055/1221  3.89  3.64  3.93  3.94  3.08

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  2  2  6  9  3.86  849/1280  3.34  3.74  4.10  4.14  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  3  0  5  6  7  3.67 1094/1277  3.61  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  2  1  4  7  7  3.76 1024/1269  3.78  4.04  4.31  4.39  3.76
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  10   3  2  1  2  3  3.00  779/ 854  3.27  3.74  4.02  4.00  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  2    Graduate      0     Major       0
  28-55     2      1.00-1.99    0      B    6
  56-83     4      2.00-2.99    7      C    9       General              0    Under-grad   22     Non-major  22
  84-150    5      3.00-3.49    1      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               18
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1470
Title        INTRO APP PROB & STAT         Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI               Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires:  27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  4  1  7  15  4.22  929/1522  4.12  4.36  4.30  4.34  4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  8  18  4.63  407/1522  4.36  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  6  21  4.78  258/1285  4.55  4.50  4.30  4.30  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  7  0  0  2  7  11  4.45  566/1476  4.31  4.37  4.22  4.26  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  9  3  4  2  2  6  3.24 1293/1412  3.52  4.07  4.06  4.03  3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 2  0  3  4  8  3.94  885/1381  4.08  4.16  4.08  4.13  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  0  3  23  4.88  119/1500  4.59  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  1  0  0  0  0  25  5.00    1/1517  4.91  4.75  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  2  9  15  4.50  385/1497  4.08  4.23  4.11  4.13  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  5  21  4.81  353/1440  4.60  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  1  3  22  4.81  765/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  3  22  4.81  217/1436  4.26  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  1  0  5  20  4.69  418/1432  4.25  4.43  4.29  4.29  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 21 1  0  0  1  2  3.75 ****/1221  3.05  3.64  3.93  3.94  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  9  2  2  4  5  2.73 1243/1280  2.98  3.74  4.10  4.14  2.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  7  2  3  4  7  3.09 1210/1277  3.39  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1  1  6  5  9  3.91  960/1269  3.70  4.04  4.31  4.39  3.91
4. Were special techniques successful                   4 19  2  0  1  0  1  2.50 ****/ 854  3.46  3.74  4.02  4.00  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 1 0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  5.00  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  5.00  4.23  4.26  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  4.95  4.58  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  5.00  4.52  4.30  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  26  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  4.39  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     26  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  23  ****  5.00  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       25  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.69  4.75  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2       0.00-0.99   1     A   16       Required for Majors  0      Graduate     1      Major      0
  28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0     B    9
  56-83      6       2.00-2.99   2     C    2       General              2      Under-grad  26      Non-major  27
  84-150    12       3.00-3.49   9     D    0
  Grad.      1       3.50-4.00   8     F    0       Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               22
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  0102            University of Maryland                        Page 1471
Title      INTRO APP PROB & STAT          Baltimore County                            JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI              Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires:  9                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56   548/1522  4.12  4.36  4.30  4.34  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   233/1522  4.36  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   165/1285  4.55  4.50  4.30  4.30  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   178/1476  4.31  4.37  4.22  4.26  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  2  1  2  1  3.00  1327/1412  3.52  4.07  4.06  4.03  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0  1  0  0  3  4.25   604/1381  4.08  4.16  4.08  4.13  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67   312/1500  4.59  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1517  4.91  4.75  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   296/1497  4.08  4.23  4.11  4.13  4.63


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   224/1440  4.60  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  1001/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   263/1436  4.26  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   187/1432  4.25  4.43  4.29  4.29  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  6  0  1  0  0  2  4.00   606/1221  3.05  3.64  3.93  3.94  4.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  0  4  1  2  3.38  1091/1280  2.98  3.74  4.10  4.14  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  1  0  3  3  1  3.38  1176/1277  3.39  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  3  3  2  3.88   972/1269  3.70  4.04  4.31  4.39  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   3  0  0  2  2  1  3.80   569/ 854  3.46  3.74  4.02  4.00  3.80


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0        A    4        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major        1
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B    5
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99    2        C    0        General              0     Under-grad    9      Non-major    8
 84-150     4      3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                8
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  0202                    University of Maryland                              Page 1472
Title          INTRO APP PROB & STAT              Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    CHOI, TAERYON                      Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 22                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   1   6   8   7  3.95 1171/1522  4.12  4.36  4.30  4.34  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   1   4   5  12  4.27  854/1522  4.36  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   1   6  15  4.64  395/1285  4.55  4.50  4.30  4.30  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   3   5  11  4.42  597/1476  4.31  4.37  4.22  4.26  4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7   0   0   2   7   6  4.27  557/1412  3.52  4.07  4.06  4.03  4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1   5   4   8  4.06  779/1381  4.08  4.16  4.08  4.13  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   0   7  15  4.68  287/1500  4.59  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1   0   0   0   9  12  4.57 1019/1517  4.91  4.75  4.65  4.62  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0  3   9   5  4.12  820/1497  4.08  4.23  4.11  4.13  4.12

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   1   5  16  4.68  578/1440  4.60  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86  602/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0   0   5   6  11  4.27  855/1436  4.26  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   1   0   1   5   3  12  4.24  899/1432  4.25  4.43  4.29  4.29  4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 1   3   6   9  4.21  486/1221  3.05  3.64  3.93  3.94  4.21

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  3   2   1   7   7  3.65  964/1280  2.98  3.74  4.10  4.14  3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  0   2   4   7   6  3.89 1016/1277  3.39  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 3  0   4   4   8  3.74 1041/1269  3.70  4.04  4.31  4.39  3.74
4. Were special techniques successful                 3  10   1   2   2   3   1  3.11  768/ 854  3.46  3.74  4.02  4.00  3.11

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18   2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  5.00  4.36  4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 2 0  0   0   2  3.00 ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 2 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  5.00  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          19   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  5.00  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  5.00  4.23  4.26  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.56  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1          0.00-0.99    1      A   10        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0       Major        0
 28-55      0          1.00-1.99    0      B    9
 56-83      6          2.00-2.99    2      C    1        General               1      Under-grad   22       Non-major   22
 84-150     3          3.00-3.49    4      D    0
 Grad.      0          3.50-4.00    2      F    0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                18
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  0301            University of Maryland                          Page 1473
Title      INTRO APP PROB & STAT          Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   ABERCROMBIE, MA             Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 10                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	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	1	4	5	4.40	733/1522	4.12	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1027/1522	4.36	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	366/1285	4.55	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	945/1476	4.31	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	760/1412	3.52	4.07	4.06	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	0	1	5	3.89	953/1381	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.13	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	275/1500	4.59	4.43	4.18	4.13	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	4.91	4.75	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1315/1497	4.08	4.23	4.11	4.13	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	931/1440	4.60	4.66	4.45	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1284/1448	4.51	4.68	4.71	4.71	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1158/1436	4.26	4.42	4.29	4.30	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1126/1432	4.25	4.43	4.29	4.29	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1211/1221	3.05	3.64	3.93	3.94	1.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	1	0	1	2.00	1273/1280	2.98	3.74	4.10	4.14	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	1119/1277	3.39	3.90	4.34	4.38	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1053/1269	3.70	4.04	4.31	4.39	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.36	4.21	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	5.00	4.42	4.35	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.95	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.95	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.48	4.11	3.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  0302                University of Maryland                          Page 1474
Title      INTRO APP PROB & STAT              Baltimore County                                JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:     ABERCROMBIE, MA               Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires:  9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5   Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  3  2  1  3   3.44 1425/1522  4.12  4.36  4.30  4.34  3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  2  4   4.00 1080/1522  4.36  4.39  4.26  4.25  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  0  3  1  4   3.78 1078/1285  4.55  4.50  4.30  4.30  3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  2  3  3   3.78 1188/1476  4.31  4.37  4.22  4.26  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  3  1  2  2   3.11 1317/1412  3.52  4.07  4.06  4.03  3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 2 4      4.25  604/1381  4.08  4.16  4.08  4.13  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  1  0  2  5   4.00  988/1500  4.59  4.43  4.18  4.13  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  9   5.00    1/1517  4.91  4.75  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 3 3 1      3.71 1174/1497  4.08  4.23  4.11  4.13  3.71


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  2  3  4   4.22 1071/1440  4.60  4.66  4.45  4.46  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  1  1  0  3  4   3.89 1387/1448  4.51  4.68  4.71  4.71  3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 2 2 3        3.56 1271/1436  4.26  4.42  4.29  4.30  3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  2  0  1  3  3   3.56 1256/1432  4.25  4.43  4.29  4.29  3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 1 2 3 0 0       2.33 1188/1221  3.05  3.64  3.93  3.94  2.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 2 1 2       3.13 1172/1280  2.98  3.74  4.10  4.14  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 3 1 1 2       3.00 1214/1277  3.39  3.90  4.34  4.38  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 2 3 2 1      3.25 1174/1269  3.70  4.04  4.31  4.39  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   6  0  1  1  0  0   2.50 ****/ 854  3.46  3.74  4.02  4.00  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 1 0 0     3.00 ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.29  ****
```

```
                                        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      0     Major       0
28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0        B   2                                                           
56-83     3       2.00-2.99   2        C   3        General              0     Under-grad    9     Non-major   9
84-150    3       3.00-3.49   3        D   0                                                           
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   1        F   0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                9
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 417  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1475
Title          TIME SERIES DATA ANLYS      Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    SINHA, BIMAL                Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies           Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  0  0  1  9  4.55  559/1522  4.55  4.36  4.30  4.42  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  0  1  1  8  4.36  750/1522  4.36  4.39  4.26  4.34  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  6  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1285  5.00  4.50  4.30  4.42  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  172/1476  4.82  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  155/1412  4.78  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  0  4  5  4.30  556/1381  4.30  4.16  4.08  4.21  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  444/1500  4.55  4.43  4.18  4.25  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.75  4.65  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  240/1497  4.70  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.70

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  643/1440  4.64  4.66  4.45  4.52  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.68  4.71  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  123/1436  4.91  4.42  4.29  4.32  4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  383/1432  4.73  4.43  4.29  4.34  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  5  1  0  1  2  1  3.40  956/1221  3.40  3.64  3.93  4.04  3.40

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67  959/1280  3.67  3.74  4.10  4.28  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  743/1277  4.33  3.90  4.34  4.50  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  461/1269  4.67  4.04  4.31  4.49  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33  726/ 854  3.33  3.74  4.02  4.31  3.33
```

```
                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0        A    8       Required for Majors   0    Graduate    2     Major       3
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B    1
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0        C    0       General               4    Under-grad  9     Non-major   8
  84-150    5      3.00-3.49    3        D    0
  Grad.     2      3.50-4.00    4        F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 6
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 433  0101                University of Maryland                          Page 1476
Title      STATISTICAL COMPUTING               Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    ROY, ANINDYA                    Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires:  7                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  380/1522  4.71  4.36  4.30 4.42 4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  465/1522  4.57  4.39  4.26 4.34 4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  531/1285  4.50  4.50  4.30 4.42 4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  265/1476  4.71  4.37  4.22 4.31 4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  493/1412  4.33  4.07  4.06 4.11 4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1   0   0   2   4  4.14  713/1381  4.14  4.16  4.08 4.21 4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  483/1500  4.50  4.43  4.18 4.25 4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.75  4.65 4.71 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   0   1   5  4.83  134/1497  4.83  4.23  4.11 4.21 4.83

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  272/1440  4.86  4.66  4.45 4.52 4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  629/1448  4.86  4.68  4.71 4.75 4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57  514/1436  4.57  4.42  4.29 4.32 4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57  558/1432  4.57  4.43  4.29 4.34 4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/1221  **** 3.64  3.93 4.04 ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  718/1280  4.00  3.74  4.10 4.28 4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  375/1277  4.75  3.90  4.34 4.50 4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   3   1  4.25  777/1269  4.25  4.04  4.31 4.49 4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   3   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 854  **** 3.74  4.02 4.31 ****

                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 228  **** 5.00  4.35 4.32 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  **** 5.00  4.51 4.55 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 216  **** 5.00  4.42 4.20 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 205  **** 5.00  4.23 3.85 ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  47  **** 5.00  4.41 4.51 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  45  **** 5.00  4.30 4.22 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39  **** 5.00  4.40 4.03 ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  37  **** 5.00  4.63 4.33 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  23  **** 5.00  4.41 4.00 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  33  **** 5.00  4.69 4.92 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       6   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  22  **** 5.00  4.54 4.25 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  18  **** 5.00  4.49 4.25 ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 453  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1477
Title       INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA          Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  WANG, XIAO                       Spring 2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  0  0  4  5  4.20  959/1522  4.20  4.36  4.30  4.42  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  0  0  6  3  4.00 1080/1522  4.00  4.39  4.26  4.34  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  1  0  1  5  3  3.90 1027/1285  3.90  4.50  4.30  4.42  3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  1  0  0  3  3  4.00 1009/1476  4.00  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  2  1  0  1  4  2  3.75 1013/1412  3.75  4.07  4.06  4.11  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  5  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  806/1381  4.00  4.16  4.08  4.21  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  3  1  6  4.30  731/1500  4.30  4.43  4.18  4.25  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  901/1517  4.70  4.75  4.65  4.71  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4  0  0  0  0  5  1  4.17  756/1497  4.17  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.17


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  877/1440  4.44  4.66  4.45  4.52  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67 1001/1448  4.67  4.68  4.71  4.75  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  0  2  4  3  4.11  995/1436  4.11  4.42  4.29  4.32  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  820/1432  4.33  4.43  4.29  4.34  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  6  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  606/1221  4.00  3.64  3.93  4.04  4.00


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5  0  1  0  1  2  1  3.40 1081/1280  3.40  3.74  4.10  4.28  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5  0  1  1  0  2  1  3.20 1197/1277  3.20  3.90  4.34  4.50  3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  5  0  1  0  2  1  1  3.20 1187/1269  3.20  4.04  4.31  4.49  3.20
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  3  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.74  4.02  4.31  ****


          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.32  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  4.22  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.40  4.03  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.31  4.13  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  9  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  4.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  23  ****  5.00  4.41  4.00  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    3      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major        2
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    2
56-83      1      2.00-2.99    0       C    2      General              1     Under-grad   10     Non-major    8
84-150     4      3.00-3.49    2       D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                6
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 470  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1478
Title       PROB ACTUARIAL SCIENCE          Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  ARMSTRONG, THOM                   Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  9                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  3  1  4  4.13 1033/1522  4.13  4.36  4.30  4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44  639/1522   4.44  4.39  4.26  4.34  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1285   ****  4.50  4.30  4.42  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5  0  1  0  1  2  4.00 1009/1476   4.00  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  806/1381   4.00  4.16  4.08  4.21  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   7  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/1500   ****  4.43  4.18  4.25  ****
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1517   5.00  4.75  4.65  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0  1  0  5  2  4.00  898/1497   4.00  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1440   ****  4.66  4.45  4.52  ****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1448   ****  4.68  4.71  4.75  ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1436   ****  4.42  4.29  4.32  ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1432   ****  4.43  4.29  4.34  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1280   5.00  3.74  4.10  4.28  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1277   5.00  3.90  4.34  4.50  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1269   ****  4.04  4.31  4.49  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1   4  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   44/  79   4.75  4.95  4.58  4.67  4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 1  6  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  77   ****  5.00  4.52  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1   6  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  65   ****  5.00  4.49  4.65  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75   35/  78   4.75  4.95  4.45  4.58  4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 2   2  3  0  0  1  1  2.40   75/  80   2.40  4.48  4.11  4.14  2.40

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 490  0101          University of Maryland                    Page 1479
Title       SPECIAL TOPICS IN STAT       Baltimore County                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  PARK, JUNYONG                Spring 2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1522  5.00  4.36  4.30  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1522  5.00  4.39  4.26  4.34  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1412  5.00  4.07  4.06  4.11  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1517  5.00  4.75  4.65  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1497  5.00  4.23  4.11  4.21  5.00


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1440  5.00  4.66  4.45  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1448  5.00  4.68  4.71  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1436  5.00  4.42  4.29  4.32  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1432  5.00  4.43  4.29  4.34  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   0    Graduate     1     Major        0
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    0
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0       C    0       General               1    Under-grad   0     Non-major    1
  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
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 602  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1480
Title        APPLIED STATISTICS II        Baltimore County                           JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  MATHEW, THOMAS                 Spring 2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
```

```
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1522  5.00  4.36  4.30  4.45  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  0 10  4.58  454/1522  4.58  4.39  4.26  4.29  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  0 10  4.58  446/1285  4.58  4.50  4.30  4.31  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  162/1476  4.83  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  101/1412  4.90  4.07  4.06  4.25  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 11  4.92   77/1381  4.92  4.16  4.08  4.25  4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   98/1500  4.92  4.43  4.18  4.22  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.75  4.65  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1  8  4.89  112/1497  4.89  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.89


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1440  5.00  4.66  4.45  4.48  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  0  9  4.80  765/1448  4.80  4.68  4.71  4.80  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  341/1436  4.73  4.42  4.29  4.37  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  161/1432  4.91  4.43  4.29  4.33  4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 2 0 0 0  1  2.33 1188/1221  2.33  3.64  3.93  3.83  2.33


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  1  0  1  3  4.20  624/1280  4.20  3.74  4.10  4.24  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  692/1277  4.40  3.90  4.34  4.52  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 1  4  4.80  332/1269  4.80  4.04  4.31  4.51  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.74  4.02  4.08  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  5.00  4.36  4.72  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50 ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.39  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 0  2  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  5.00  4.51  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  5.00  4.42  4.76  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 205  ****  5.00  4.23  4.40  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1  1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  4.95  4.58  4.76  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  77  ****  5.00  4.52  4.70  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1  1  4.50 ****/  65  ****  5.00  4.49  4.71  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  78  ****  4.95  4.45  4.66  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  80  ****  4.48  4.11  4.38  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.40  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  4.49  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.40  4.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.31  4.71  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  34  ****  5.00  4.30  4.82  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1  1  4.50 ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  23  ****  5.00  4.41  4.68  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.69  4.79  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  22  ****  5.00  4.54  4.83  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  18  ****  5.00  4.49  4.92  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: STAT 603  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1481
Title        CATEGOR DATA ANAL                    Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  RUKHIN, ANDREW                         Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires:  13                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   0   8   5  4.38  756/1522  4.38  4.36  4.30  4.45  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   4   3   6  4.15  976/1522  4.15  4.39  4.26  4.29  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   7   6  4.46  578/1285  4.46  4.50  4.30  4.31  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   4   0   0   1   4   4  4.33  703/1476  4.33  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   3   0   0   1   5   4  4.30  520/1412  4.30  4.07  4.06  4.25  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   1   0   0   2   4   6  4.33  519/1381  4.33  4.16  4.08  4.25  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1   0   0   2   3   7  4.42  615/1500  4.42  4.43  4.18  4.22  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   0   5   7  4.58 1011/1517  4.58  4.75  4.65  4.73  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   1   0   0   3   4   4  4.09  839/1497  4.09  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.09

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   1   7   5  4.31 1007/1440  4.31  4.66  4.45  4.48  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   1   1   2   9  4.46 1190/1448  4.46  4.68  4.71  4.80  4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   1   0   2   4   6  4.08 1018/1436  4.08  4.42  4.29  4.37  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   0   2   5   5  4.00 1036/1432  4.00  4.43  4.29  4.33  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  10   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/1221  ****  3.64  3.93  3.83  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8   0   0   0   4   1   0  3.20 1150/1280  3.20  3.74  4.10  4.24  3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8   0   0   1   1   2   1  3.60 1113/1277  3.60  3.90  4.34  4.52  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  8   0   0   0   0   4   1  4.20  816/1269  4.20  4.04  4.31  4.51  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                 8   3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 854  ****  3.74  4.02  4.08  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3      0.00-0.99    0      A    10      Required for Majors  2    Graduate       7      Major       12
28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B     1                                                       
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C     0      General              7    Under-grad     6      Non-major    1
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    3      D     0                                                       
Grad.      7      3.50-4.00    7      F     0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P     0                                responses to be significant
                                      I     0      Other                3
                                      ?     1
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 612  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1482
Title       MATHEMATICAL STAT II          Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  SINHA, BIMAL   (Instr. A)    Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     4
Questionnaires:  4                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.39	4.26	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.16	4.08	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.43	4.18	4.22	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.23	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.66	4.45	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.68	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.64	3.93	3.83	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	3.74	4.10	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.90	4.34	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.04	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.74	4.02	4.08	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.72	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.39	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.76	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.40	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.95	4.58	4.76	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.70	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.71	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.95	4.45	4.66	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.48	4.11	4.38	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.49	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.78	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.71	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.82	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.83	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 18	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.92	5.00

```
Course-Section: STAT 612  0101                    University of Maryland                        Page 1482
Title         MATHEMATICAL STAT II                   Baltimore County                          JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   SINHA, BIMAL    (Instr. A)              Spring 2007                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       4
Questionnaires:   4                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: STAT 612  0101                  University of Maryland                            Page 1483
Title          MATHEMATICAL STAT II             Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:                    (Instr. B)       Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       4
Questionnaires:   4                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1522    5.00  4.36  4.30 4.45  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  255/1522    4.75  4.39  4.26 4.29  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1285    5.00  4.50  4.30 4.31  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1476    5.00  4.37  4.22 4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1412    5.00  4.07  4.06 4.25  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1381    5.00  4.16  4.08 4.25  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  211/1500    4.75  4.43  4.18 4.22  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  802/1517    4.75  4.75  4.65 4.73  4.75

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1440    5.00  4.66  4.45 4.48  5.00

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1280    5.00  3.74  4.10 4.24  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1277    5.00  3.90  4.34 4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1269    5.00  4.04  4.31 4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 854    5.00  3.74  4.02 4.08  5.00

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 215    5.00  5.00  4.36 4.72  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00    1/ 228    5.00  5.00  4.35 4.39  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 217    5.00  5.00  4.51 4.61  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 216    5.00  5.00  4.42 4.76  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 205    5.00  5.00  4.23 4.40  5.00

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  79    5.00  4.95  4.58 4.76  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  77    5.00  5.00  4.52 4.70  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  65    5.00  5.00  4.49 4.71  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  78    5.00  4.95  4.45 4.66  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  80    5.00  4.48  4.11 4.38  5.00

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  47    5.00  5.00  4.41 4.40  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  45    5.00  5.00  4.30 4.49  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  39    5.00  5.00  4.40 4.78  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  35    5.00  5.00  4.31 4.71  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  34    5.00  5.00  4.30 4.82  5.00

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  37    5.00  5.00  4.63 4.82  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  23    5.00  5.00  4.41 4.68  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  33    5.00  5.00  4.69 4.79  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  22    5.00  5.00  4.54 4.83  5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  18    5.00  5.00  4.49 4.92  5.00
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 612  0101                   University of Maryland                        Page 1483
Title           MATHEMATICAL STAT II             Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:                     (Instr. B)       Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       4
Questionnaires:   4                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                     Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1        0.00-0.99    0        A    2         Required for Majors   0     Graduate      2      Major        3
  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   0        3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.    2        3.50-4.00    1        F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                 4
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 612  0101                University of Maryland                                Page 1484
Title           MATHEMATICAL STAT II          Baltimore County                                     JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:                  (Instr. C)       Spring 2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     4
Questionnaires: 4                             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1522  5.00  4.36  4.30 4.45  5.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  255/1522  4.75  4.39  4.26 4.29  4.75
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1285  5.00  4.50  4.30 4.31  5.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1476  5.00  4.37  4.22 4.31  5.00
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1412  5.00  4.07  4.06 4.25  5.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1381  5.00  4.16  4.08 4.25  5.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  211/1500  4.75  4.43  4.18 4.22  4.75
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  802/1517  4.75  4.75  4.65 4.73  4.75

           Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1440  5.00  4.66  4.45 4.48  5.00

           Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1280  5.00  3.74  4.10 4.24  5.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1277  5.00  3.90  4.34 4.52  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1269  5.00  4.04  4.31 4.51  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 854  5.00  3.74  4.02 4.08  5.00

           Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 215  5.00  5.00  4.36 4.72  5.00
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 228  5.00  5.00  4.35 4.39  5.00
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 217  5.00  5.00  4.51 4.61  5.00
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 216  5.00  5.00  4.42 4.76  5.00
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 205  5.00  5.00  4.23 4.40  5.00

           Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  79  5.00  4.95  4.58 4.76  5.00
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  77  5.00  5.00  4.52 4.70  5.00
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  65  5.00  5.00  4.49 4.71  5.00
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  78  5.00  4.95  4.45 4.66  5.00
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  80  5.00  4.48  4.11 4.38  5.00

           Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  47  5.00  5.00  4.41 4.40  5.00
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  45  5.00  5.00  4.30 4.49  5.00
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation        3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  39  5.00  5.00  4.40 4.78  5.00
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  35  5.00  5.00  4.31 4.71  5.00
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  34  5.00  5.00  4.30 4.82  5.00

           Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  37  5.00  5.00  4.63 4.82  5.00
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  23  5.00  5.00  4.41 4.68  5.00
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  33  5.00  5.00  4.69 4.79  5.00
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  22  5.00  5.00  4.54 4.83  5.00
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      3   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/  18  5.00  5.00  4.49 4.92  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	3
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	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: STAT 614  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1485
Title       ENVIRONMENTAL STAT              Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  NEERCHAL, NAGAR                Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  0  0  5  0  4.00 1122/1522  4.00  4.36  4.30  4.45  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  1  2  2  0  3.20 1458/1522  3.20  4.39  4.26  4.29  3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   4   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1285  ****  4.50  4.30  4.31  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  5  0  4.00 1009/1476  4.00  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   0  0  2  1  0  3.33 1257/1412  3.33  4.07  4.06  4.25  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  0  4  1  4.20  663/1381  4.20  4.16  4.08  4.25  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1   1  0  2  1  0  2.75 1458/1500  2.75  4.43  4.18  4.22  2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  4  1  4.20 1301/1517  4.20  4.75  4.65  4.73  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1   0  0  0  2  2  4.50  385/1497  4.50  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.50

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  0  3  2  4.40  931/1440  4.40  4.66  4.45  4.48  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  765/1448  4.80  4.68  4.71  4.80  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  217/1436  4.80  4.42  4.29  4.37  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  1  0  3  1  3.80 1170/1432  3.80  4.43  4.29  4.33  3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0  1  1  1  1  3.50  899/1221  3.50  3.64  3.93  3.83  3.50

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0  0  0  2  0  4.00  718/1280  4.00  3.74  4.10  4.24  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  594/1277  4.50  3.90  4.34  4.52  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  586/1269  4.50  4.04  4.31  4.51  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   0   0  0  0  2  0  4.00  426/ 854  4.00  3.74  4.02  4.08  4.00


                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 617  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1486
Title        TIME SERIES ANALYSIS            Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  ROY, ANINDYA                    Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires:  4                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1522    5.00  4.36  4.30  4.45  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  255/1522    4.75  4.39  4.26  4.29  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  938/1285    4.00  4.50  4.30  4.31  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  226/1476    4.75  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1412    5.00  4.07  4.06  4.25  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1381    5.00  4.16  4.08  4.25  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1500    5.00  4.43  4.18  4.22  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 1080/1517   4.50  4.75  4.65  4.73  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  0  1  3  4.75  189/1497    4.75  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.75


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  452/1440    4.75  4.66  4.45  4.48  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1448    5.00  4.68  4.71  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  295/1436    4.75  4.42  4.29  4.37  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1432    5.00  4.43  4.29  4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1221    5.00  3.64  3.93  3.83  5.00


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1280    5.00  3.74  4.10  4.24  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1277    5.00  3.90  4.34  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1269    5.00  4.04  4.31  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 854    5.00  3.74  4.02  4.08  5.00


         Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 215    5.00  5.00  4.36  4.72  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 228    5.00  5.00  4.35  4.39  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 217    5.00  5.00  4.51  4.61  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 216    5.00  5.00  4.42  4.76  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 205    5.00  5.00  4.23  4.40  5.00


         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  79    5.00  4.95  4.58  4.76  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  77    5.00  5.00  4.52  4.70  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  65    5.00  5.00  4.49  4.71  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  78    5.00  4.95  4.45  4.66  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  80    5.00  4.48  4.11  4.38  5.00


         Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  47    5.00  5.00  4.41  4.40  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  45    5.00  5.00  4.30  4.49  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  39    5.00  5.00  4.40  4.78  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  35    5.00  5.00  4.31  4.71  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  34    5.00  5.00  4.30  4.82  5.00


         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  37    5.00  5.00  4.63  4.82  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  23    5.00  5.00  4.41  4.68  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  33    5.00  5.00  4.69  4.79  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  22    5.00  5.00  4.54  4.83  5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  18    5.00  5.00  4.49  4.92  5.00
```

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 653  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1487
Title       BASIC MATH STAT                  Baltimore County                                JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  CHOI, TAERYON                      Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires: 10                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  404/1522  4.70  4.36  4.30  4.45  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  201/1522  4.80  4.39  4.26  4.29  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  337/1285  4.70  4.50  4.30  4.31  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  1  0  3  4  4.25  792/1476  4.25  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  621/1412  4.20  4.07  4.06  4.25  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1381  5.00  4.16  4.08  4.25  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1500  5.00  4.43  4.18  4.22  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  932/1517  4.67  4.75  4.65  4.73  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  481/1497  4.43  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.43


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  224/1440  4.89  4.66  4.45  4.48  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.68  4.71  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  151/1436  4.88  4.42  4.29  4.37  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  327/1432  4.78  4.43  4.29  4.33  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1221  5.00  3.64  3.93  3.83  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  718/1280  4.00  3.74  4.10  4.24  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  849/1277  4.20  3.90  4.34  4.52  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  509/1269  4.60  4.04  4.31  4.51  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  3  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  ****/ 854  ****  3.74  4.02  4.08  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1522  5.00  4.36  4.30  4.45  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   545/1522  4.50  4.39  4.26  4.29  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1285  5.00  4.50  4.30  4.31  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1476  5.00  4.37  4.22  4.31  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1412  5.00  4.07  4.06  4.25  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1381  5.00  4.16  4.08  4.25  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1500  5.00  4.43  4.18  4.22  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  1389/1517  4.00  4.75  4.65  4.73  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1497  5.00  4.23  4.11  4.21  5.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1440  5.00  4.66  4.45  4.48  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1448  5.00  4.68  4.71  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1436  5.00  4.42  4.29  4.37  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1432  5.00  4.43  4.29  4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1221  5.00  3.64  3.93  3.83  5.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1280  5.00  3.74  4.10  4.24  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1277  5.00  3.90  4.34  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1269  5.00  4.04  4.31  4.51  5.00
```

                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: STAT 710  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page 1489
Title           TOP:MATH STAT/STAT INF               Baltimore County                                JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:     RUKHIN, ANDREW                         Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires: 5                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  246/1522  4.80  4.36  4.30  4.45  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  255/1522  4.75  4.39  4.26  4.29  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1285  ****  4.50  4.30  4.31  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  178/1476  4.80  4.37  4.22  4.31  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1412  5.00  4.07  4.06  4.25  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 3  4.75  149/1381  4.75  4.16  4.08  4.25  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1500  5.00  4.43  4.18  4.22  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40 1161/1517  4.40  4.75  4.65  4.73  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80  147/1497  4.80  4.23  4.11  4.21  4.80


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  353/1440  4.80  4.66  4.45  4.48  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.68  4.71  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  217/1436  4.80  4.42  4.29  4.37  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  527/1432  4.60  4.43  4.29  4.33  4.60


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  390/1280  4.50  3.74  4.10  4.24  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  594/1277  4.50  3.90  4.34  4.52  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50  586/1269  4.50  4.04  4.31  4.51  4.50


             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/ 228  ****  5.00  4.35  4.39  ****


             Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/  77  ****  5.00  4.52  4.70  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  47  ****  5.00  4.41  4.40  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  45  ****  5.00  4.30  4.49  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  37  ****  5.00  4.63  4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    4   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  23  ****  5.00  4.41  4.68  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      4   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.69  4.79  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                 Majors

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99  0          A    4       Required for Majors  2        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              2        Under-grad   1        Non-major    0
84-150     0        3.00-3.49  0          D    0
Grad.      4        3.50-4.00  4          F    0       Electives            0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                1
                                          ?    0
```