Course-Section: STAT 121 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1586
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D (Instr. A)   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 74
Questionnaires: 38   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	0	1	3	7	12	14	3.95	1206/1639	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.08	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	18	15	4.22	895/1639	4.30	4.46	4.22	4.17	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	14	18	4.24	804/1397	4.39	4.50	4.28	4.18	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	2	2	7	12	4.13	919/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.01	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	3	4	3	7	12	3.72	1081/1532	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.88	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	884/1504	4.15	4.24	4.05	3.78	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	8	24	4.49	518/1612	4.46	4.54	4.16	4.10	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	1	4	19	5	3.97	955/1579	4.07	4.21	4.08	3.95	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	7	26	4.57	733/1518	4.68	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	10	24	4.51	1180/1520	4.75	4.70	4.70	4.61	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	13	17	4.22	928/1517	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	8	24	4.46	703/1550	4.57	4.54	4.22	4.17	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	20	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	623/1295	4.05	3.93	3.94	3.84	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	11	19	4.28	608/1398	4.00	3.75	4.07	3.85	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	6	7	12	10	3.59	1194/1391	3.68	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	4	10	6	16	3.94	998/1388	3.99	4.01	4.28	4.01	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	28	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	****/ 958	3.54	3.61	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1587
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D (Instr. B)   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 74
Questionnaires: 38   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	0	1	3	7	12	14	3.95	1206/1639	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.08	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	18	15	4.22	895/1639	4.30	4.46	4.22	4.17	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	14	18	4.24	804/1397	4.39	4.50	4.28	4.18	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	2	2	7	12	4.13	919/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.01	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	3	4	3	7	12	3.72	1081/1532	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.88	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	884/1504	4.15	4.24	4.05	3.78	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	8	24	4.49	518/1612	4.46	4.54	4.16	4.10	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	****/1579	4.07	4.21	4.08	3.95	3.97

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	684/1518	4.68	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1115/1520	4.75	4.70	4.70	4.61	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	474/1517	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	288/1550	4.57	4.54	4.22	4.17	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1295	4.05	3.93	3.94	3.84	4.00

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	11	19	4.28	608/1398	4.00	3.75	4.07	3.85	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	6	7	12	10	3.59	1194/1391	3.68	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	4	10	6	16	3.94	998/1388	3.99	4.01	4.28	4.01	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	28	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	****/ 958	3.54	3.61	3.93	3.71	****

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
Enrollment: 62
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall   2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	11	23	4.15	1003/1639	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.08	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	29	4.46	600/1639	4.30	4.46	4.22	4.17	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	32	4.61	417/1397	4.39	4.50	4.28	4.18	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	0	5	8	12	4.15	891/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.01	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	9	15	18	4.04	744/1532	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.88	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	594/1504	4.15	4.24	4.05	3.78	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	10	31	4.48	532/1612	4.46	4.54	4.16	4.10	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	24	21	4.47	1175/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.56	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	1	19	10	4.30	601/1579	4.07	4.21	4.08	3.95	4.30

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	7	36	4.77	416/1518	4.68	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	42	4.91	546/1520	4.75	4.70	4.70	4.61	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	8	31	4.57	523/1517	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	9	33	4.68	435/1550	4.57	4.54	4.22	4.17	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	2	1	10	2	9	3.63	917/1295	4.05	3.93	3.94	3.84	3.63

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	3	7	26	4.38	525/1398	4.00	3.75	4.07	3.85	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	2	10	26	4.41	686/1391	3.68	3.95	4.30	4.07	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	7	5	24	4.23	847/1388	3.99	4.01	4.28	4.01	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	6	23	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	690/ 958	3.54	3.61	3.93	3.71	3.59

Laboratory

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	3	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
Enrollment: 62
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall   2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1588
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	15			Under-grad	46	Non-major	46
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	4	General	1				
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR
Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall   2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1589
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Questions	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	2	1	5	12	10	3.90	1252/1639	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.08	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	4	17	4.17	948/1639	4.30	4.46	4.22	4.17	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	8	16	4.20	850/1397	4.39	4.50	4.28	4.18	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	10	15	4.24	802/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.01	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	7	8	7	3.87	942/1532	3.98	4.14	4.01	3.88	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	12	11	4.07	786/1504	4.15	4.24	4.05	3.78	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	19	4.40	632/1612	4.46	4.54	4.16	4.10	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	463/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.56	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1039/1579	4.07	4.21	4.08	3.95	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	491/1518	4.68	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	648/1520	4.75	4.70	4.70	4.61	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	8	18	4.37	768/1517	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	8	19	4.43	729/1550	4.57	4.54	4.22	4.17	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	5	4	12	3.96	677/1295	4.05	3.93	3.94	3.84	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	5	8	7	3.13	1248/1398	4.00	3.75	4.07	3.85	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	8	2	7	6	6	3.00	1321/1391	3.68	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	1	2	13	8	3.62	1148/1388	3.99	4.01	4.28	4.01	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	1	22	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	****/ 958	3.54	3.61	3.93	3.71	****

```
                    Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    28   1   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/ 224  ****  ****  4.10  3.90  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.11  4.01  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             28   1   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.43  ****

                    Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  28   0   0   0   1   0   1   4.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  28   0   0   0   1   0   1   4.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  3.90  ****

                    Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  3.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  3.51  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.79  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     28   0   1   0   0   0   1   3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  5.00  ****

                    Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  4.54  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         28   1   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       28   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301   University of Maryland   Page 1589
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 30   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                   Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3           0.00-0.99   1    A   13      Required for Majors   6     Graduate      0        Major      0
28-55     5           1.00-1.99   0    B   11                                                                  
56-83     1           2.00-2.99   3    C    5      General               4     Under-grad   30        Non-major  30
84-150    4           3.00-3.49   7    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                18
                                       ?    0
```

Course-Section: STAT 121 0401   University of Maryland   Page 1590
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 26   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  5 11  9 4.08 1089/1639  4.00 4.34  4.27 4.08  4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  1  2  8 15 4.42  650/1639  4.30 4.46  4.22 4.17  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  9 17 4.65  375/1397  4.39 4.50  4.28 4.18  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  3  0  2  0 11  9 4.23  822/1583  4.17 4.35  4.19 4.01  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  3  5 16 4.54  311/1532  3.98 4.14  4.01 3.88  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  4  0  1  0  7 13 4.52  351/1504  4.15 4.24  4.05 3.78  4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  1  2  7 15 4.44  575/1612  4.46 4.54  4.16 4.10  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  0 25 5.00    1/1635  4.88 4.75  4.65 4.56  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  0  0  0 17  2 4.11  830/1579  4.07 4.21  4.08 3.95  4.11

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  1  5 19 4.72  529/1518  4.68 4.70  4.43 4.38  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  1  2 22 4.84  699/1520  4.75 4.70  4.70 4.61  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  5 18 4.64  428/1517  4.48 4.42  4.27 4.20  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  1  0  3  3 18 4.48  664/1550  4.57 4.54  4.22 4.17  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3  0  0  3  2 16 4.62  215/1295  4.05 3.93  3.94 3.84  4.62

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  2  2  9 10 3.92  863/1398  4.00 3.75  4.07 3.85  3.92
```

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	3	5	7	9	3.80	1124/1391	3.68	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	5	5	12	4.22	860/1388	3.99	4.01	4.28	4.01	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	725/ 958	3.54	3.61	3.93	3.71	3.50

Laboratory

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****

Seminar

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****

Field Work

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****

Self Paced

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0401   University of Maryland   Page 1590
Title   INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 26   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1591
Title   STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: JACOBS, JUSTIN   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 42   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor 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	1	11	30	4.69	391/1639	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	35	4.83	184/1639	4.74	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	35	4.81	230/1397	4.84	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	5	7	22	4.33	697/1583	4.48	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	4	7	6	15	3.91	911/1532	3.97	4.14	4.01	4.05	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	4	8	17	4.26	612/1504	4.25	4.24	4.05	4.12	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	35	4.74	238/1612	4.56	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	33	9	4.21	1382/1635	4.74	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	0	12	21	4.53	362/1579	4.21	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.53

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	39	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.90

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	37	4.86	674/1520	4.67	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	37	4.86	198/1517	4.85	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	36	4.79	313/1550	4.76	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	167/1295	4.18	3.93	3.94	3.95	4.69

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	4	3	6	19	3.67	1030/1398	3.50	3.75	4.07	4.13	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	6	5	7	20	4.00	983/1391	3.84	3.95	4.30	4.35	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	3	6	9	19	4.11	918/1388	3.68	4.01	4.28	4.34	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	5	29	1	2	0	0	5	3.75	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	3.97	****

Laboratory

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****

Seminar

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****

Field Work

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****

Self Paced

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0101        University of Maryland                          Page 1591
Title          STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI  Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    JACOBS, JUSTIN          Fall   2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    61
Questionnaires: 42                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	27	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	42
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	32				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0301        University of Maryland                          Page 1592
Title          STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI  Baltimore County                               FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    KAPOOR, JAGMOHA (Instr. A)  Fall   2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    68
Questionnaires: 23                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	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	3	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	754/1639	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	316/1639	4.74	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	196/1397	4.84	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	423/1583	4.48	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	3	2	1	8	4.00	774/1532	3.97	4.14	4.01	4.05	4.00

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	612/1504	4.25	4.24	4.05	4.12	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	532/1612	4.56	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.74	4.75	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	818/1579	4.21	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.06

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	360/1518	4.90	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	1213/1520	4.67	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	371/1517	4.85	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	638/1550	4.76	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	894/1295	4.18	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.67

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	3	6	4	3.41	1156/1398	3.50	3.75	4.07	4.13	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	2	5	7	3.76	1141/1391	3.84	3.95	4.30	4.35	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	1	4	3	6	3.47	1197/1388	3.68	4.01	4.28	4.34	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	3.97	****

Seminar

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****

Field Work

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****

Self Paced

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0301
Title   STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 68
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall   2007

Page 1593
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	754/1639	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	316/1639	4.74	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	196/1397	4.84	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	423/1583	4.48	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	3	2	1	8	4.00	774/1532	3.97	4.14	4.01	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	612/1504	4.25	4.24	4.05	4.12	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	532/1612	4.56	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.74	4.75	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	889/1579	4.21	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.06

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	4.90	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1033/1520	4.67	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	4.85	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550	4.76	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1295	4.18	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.67

Discussion
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	3	6	4	3.41	1156/1398	3.50	3.75	4.07	4.13	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	2	5	7	3.76	1141/1391	3.84	3.95	4.30	4.35	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	1	4	3	6	3.47	1197/1388	3.68	4.01	4.28	4.34	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	3.97	****

Seminar
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****

Field Work
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****

Self Paced
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4			Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0				
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	417/1639	4.35	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	220/1639	4.59	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	168/1397	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	4	8	10	4.13	910/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	5	5	9	9	4.21	616/1532	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.05	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1194/1504	3.76	4.24	4.05	4.12	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	459/1612	4.48	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	529/1635	4.56	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	134/1579	4.40	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	170/1518	4.76	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	437/1520	4.65	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	173/1517	4.56	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	196/1550	4.62	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	746/1295	3.55	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.89

Discussion

Questions	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	1	0	8	4	6	6	4	2.79	1326/1398	3.46	3.75	4.07	4.13	2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	4	4	9	3	2.89	1349/1391	3.42	3.95	4.30	4.35	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	3	6	6	6	3.11	1304/1388	3.46	4.01	4.28	4.34	3.11
4. Were special techniques successful	2	24	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 958	2.73	3.61	3.93	3.97	****

Laboratory

Questions	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	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****

Seminar

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	21				
				?	2						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
Title   APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall   2007

Page 1595
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	2	0	1	0	3	13	20	4.38	780/1639	4.35	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	10	24	4.54	476/1639	4.59	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	3	9	21	4.33	722/1397	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	2	8	5	19	4.21	843/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	0	4	6	9	10	3.86	942/1532	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.05	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	6	2	3	4	8	11	3.82	997/1504	3.76	4.24	4.05	4.12	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	3	8	22	4.50	490/1612	4.48	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	4	25	3	3.91	1569/1635	4.56	4.75	4.65	4.66	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	1	1	13	9	4.25	657/1579	4.40	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	733/1518	4.76	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	7	24	4.69	1006/1520	4.65	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	1	12	15	4.33	800/1517	4.56	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	729/1550	4.62	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	18	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1093/1295	3.55	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	4	7	13	4.07	745/1398	3.46	3.75	4.07	4.13	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	2	4	8	12	4.04	968/1391	3.42	3.95	4.30	4.35	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	8	6	11	3.93	1016/1388	3.46	4.01	4.28	4.34	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	13	15	3	3	1	2	2	2.73	899/ 958	2.73	3.61	3.93	3.97	2.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****

```
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned    38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.47  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned        38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.65  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                    38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.08  ****

                        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned     38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.04  4.78  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria     38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.05  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation           38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations       38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.52  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities     38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.56  4.30  ****

                        Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned    38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal        38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.51  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful          38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful           38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students         38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
```

Course-Section: STAT 351   0201   University of Maryland   Page 1595
Title   APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 39   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                        Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0      A   18      Required for Majors   1     Graduate       0       Major        0
 28-55     5      1.00-1.99   0      B   11
 56-83     8      2.00-2.99   9      C    2      General               0     Under-grad    39       Non-major   39
 84-150    7      3.00-3.49   7      D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                30
                                      ?    0
```

Course-Section: STAT 351   0301   University of Maryland   Page 1596
Title   APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 69
Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	6	11	4.00	1138/1639	4.35	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	617/1639	4.59	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	18	4.52	497/1397	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	9	10	4.18	862/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	6	5	7	3.75	1046/1532	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.05	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	908/1504	3.76	4.24	4.05	4.12	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	17	4.40	632/1612	4.48	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	766/1635	4.56	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	9	9	4.14	795/1579	4.40	4.21	4.08	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	378/1518	4.76	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	3	3	16	4.33	1318/1520	4.65	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	661/1517	4.56	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	591/1550	4.62	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	978/1295	3.55	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	5	4	7	3.52	1099/1398	3.46	3.75	4.07	4.13	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	3	8	2	6	3.33	1265/1391	3.42	3.95	4.30	4.35	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	5	6	4	5	3.33	1248/1388	3.46	4.01	4.28	4.34	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	16	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 958	2.73	3.61	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****

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

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****

Seminar

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****

Field Work

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****

Self Paced

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 0301
Title   APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
Enrollment: 69
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1596
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8			Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0				
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0			#### - Means there are not enough			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101
Title   INTRO APP PROB & STAT
Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1597
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

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

General

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	919/1639	4.05	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	709/1639	4.27	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	313/1397	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	697/1583	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1112/1532	3.65	4.14	4.01	4.05	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	945/1504	3.69	4.24	4.05	4.12	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	197/1612	4.50	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.75	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	10	2	3.93	1005/1579	3.73	4.21	4.08	4.07	3.93

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	602/1518	4.55	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1151/1520	4.48	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	535/1517	4.26	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	832/1550	4.13	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1122/1295	3.25	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.20

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	3	4	3	2.82	1321/1398	2.99	3.75	4.07	4.13	2.82

Questions								Mean	Rank					
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	3	4	3	3	3.00	1321/1391	3.23	3.95	4.30	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	4	3	3	2.93	1335/1388	3.35	4.01	4.28	4.34	2.93
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	3.75	3.61	3.93	3.97	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
Title   INTRO APP PROB & STAT
Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall   2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1598
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	2	3	17	11	4.12	1042/1639	4.05	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	21	4.58	445/1639	4.27	4.46	4.22	4.20	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	427/1397	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	12	13	4.27	781/1583	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	5	12	6	3.73	1069/1532	3.65	4.14	4.01	4.05	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	5	6	7	8	3.50	1212/1504	3.69	4.24	4.05	4.12	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	8	20	4.42	603/1612	4.50	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	265/1635	4.98	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	8	14	6	3.93	1022/1579	3.73	4.21	4.08	4.07	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	472/1518	4.55	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	1060/1520	4.48	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	622/1517	4.26	4.42	4.27	4.23	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	20	4.39	787/1550	4.13	4.54	4.22	4.20	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	5	10	7	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.25	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	10	6	8	4	1	2.31	1375/1398	2.99	3.75	4.07	4.13	2.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	6	7	11	1	3	2.57	1374/1391	3.23	3.95	4.30	4.35	2.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	4	13	3	4	3.04	1316/1388	3.35	4.01	4.28	4.34	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	5	23	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	****/ 958	3.75	3.61	3.93	3.97	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
Title   INTRO APP PROB & STAT
Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall   2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1599
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	2	6	4	5	16	3.82	1318/1639	4.05	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.82

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	11	12	3.85	1300/1639	4.27	4.46	4.22	4.20	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	8	17	4.12	916/1397	4.48	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	4	9	12	3.77	1247/1583	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.24	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	3	4	6	8	3.54	1218/1532	3.65	4.14	4.01	4.05	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	1	6	9	8	3.67	1116/1504	3.69	4.24	4.05	4.12	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	7	18	4.31	743/1612	4.50	4.54	4.16	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	265/1635	4.98	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	13	9	4	3.33	1390/1579	3.73	4.21	4.08	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	8	18	4.25	1094/1518	4.55	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	4	5	20	4.25	1356/1520	4.48	4.70	4.70	4.68	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	6	7	13	3.75	1260/1517	4.26	4.42	4.27	4.23	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	3	4	4	15	3.68	1270/1550	4.13	4.54	4.22	4.20	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	2	4	4	4	8	3.55	958/1295	3.25	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	0	6	7	13	3.83	916/1398	2.99	3.75	4.07	4.13	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	6	6	16	4.13	911/1391	3.23	3.95	4.30	4.35	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	8	5	15	4.07	928/1388	3.35	4.01	4.28	4.34	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	1	1	6	1	7	3.75	610/ 958	3.75	3.61	3.93	3.97	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	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	29				
				?	2						

Course-Section: STAT 451 0101
Title INTRO PROBABILITY THEO
Instructor: WANG, XIAO
Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 1600
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	2	2	7	9	4.15	1003/1639	4.15	4.34	4.27	4.42	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.46	4.22	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	6	7	3.70	1200/1397	3.70	4.50	4.28	4.38	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.35	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	4.14	4.01	4.07	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	678/1504	4.18	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.54	4.16	4.18	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	1467/1579	3.07	4.21	4.08	4.21	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	891/1518	4.45	4.70	4.43	4.51	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1397/1520	4.10	4.70	4.70	4.75	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	5	5	5	3.42	1376/1517	3.42	4.42	4.27	4.34	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	6	8	3.70	1259/1550	3.70	4.54	4.22	4.24	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1132/1295	3.17	3.93	3.94	4.01	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	1349/1398	2.60	3.75	4.07	4.23	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1192/1391	3.60	3.95	4.30	4.48	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1226/1388	3.40	4.01	4.28	4.50	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5

Course-Section: STAT 454 0101 University of Maryland Page 1601
Title APPLIED STATISTICS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1296/1639	3.85	4.34	4.27	4.42	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	4	7	4.08	1036/1639	4.08	4.46	4.22	4.29	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	574/1397	4.46	4.50	4.28	4.38	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.35	4.19	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.14	4.01	4.07	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	4.24	4.05	4.20	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.54	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1311/1635	4.31	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	4.21	4.08	4.21	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	968/1518	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1222/1520	4.46	4.70	4.70	4.75	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	5	1	5	3.54	1335/1517	3.54	4.42	4.27	4.34	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1144/1550	3.92	4.54	4.22	4.24	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	929/1295	3.60	3.93	3.94	4.01	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	1342/1398	2.67	3.75	4.07	4.23	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	983/1391	4.00	3.95	4.30	4.48	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1292/1388	3.17	4.01	4.28	4.50	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	7	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 455 0101 University of Maryland Page 1602
Title DESIGN QUALITY CONTROL Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.50	4.28	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.35	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.05	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.54	4.16	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.21	4.08	4.21	5.00

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor 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	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.54	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.93	3.94	4.01	5.00

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.75	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	5.00

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	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 490 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1603
Title   SPECIAL TOPICS IN STAT   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON   Fall 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

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor 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	508/1639	4.60	4.34	4.27	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.46	4.22	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.50	4.28	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.35	4.19	4.31	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	633/1532	4.20	4.14	4.01	4.07	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.05	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.54	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.40	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.75

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor 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	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.54	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	346/1295	4.40	3.93	3.94	4.01	4.40

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	625/1398	4.25	3.75	4.07	4.23	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1391	4.25	3.95	4.30	4.48	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 601 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1604
Title   APPLIED STATISTICS I   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA   Fall 2007   Job IRBR3029

```
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	Freq 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	0	1	13	4.93	137/1639	4.93	4.34	4.27	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.46	4.22	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.37	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.35	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	287/1532	4.58	4.14	4.01	4.10	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	139/1612	4.86	4.54	4.16	4.27	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	262/1579	4.64	4.21	4.08	4.17	4.64
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	170/1518	4.93	4.70	4.43	4.49	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	837/1520	4.79	4.70	4.70	4.79	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	556/1550	4.57	4.54	4.22	4.23	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.93	3.94	3.95	4.00
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1198/1398	3.29	3.75	4.07	4.22	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	793/1391	4.29	3.95	4.30	4.47	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.01	4.28	4.49	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

```
Enrollment:       8
Questionnaires:   7                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	Freq 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	2	0	5	4.43	726/1639	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.42	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.46	4.22	4.26	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.50	4.28	4.37	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.35	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	724/1504	4.14	4.24	4.05	4.29	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.54	4.16	4.27	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	736/1635	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.81	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.21	4.08	4.17	4.60
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.70	4.43	4.49	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	347/1517	4.71	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	401/1550	4.71	4.54	4.22	4.23	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	3.93	3.94	3.95	****
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.75	4.07	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1220/1391	3.50	3.95	4.30	4.47	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 616 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1606
Title   NONPARAMETRIC STATISTI   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: WANG, XIAO   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.46	4.22	4.26	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1583	4.78	4.35	4.19	4.31	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	113/1532	4.89	4.14	4.01	4.10	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	329/1504	4.56	4.24	4.05	4.29	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	439/1612	4.56	4.54	4.16	4.27	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.75	4.65	4.81	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.21	4.08	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	891/1518	4.44	4.70	4.43	4.49	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	674/1517	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	716/1550	4.44	4.54	4.22	4.23	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.93	3.94	3.95	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	625/1398	4.25	3.75	4.07	4.22	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.01	4.28	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.74	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.39	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****

```
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  4.42  ****
```

Course-Section: STAT 616   0101   University of Maryland   Page 1606
Title   NONPARAMETRIC STATISTI   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: WANG, XIAO   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 619   0101   University of Maryland   Page 1607
Title   BIOSTATISTICS   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11
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	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1588/1639	3.13	4.34	4.27	4.42	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.46	4.22	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1337/1397	3.20	4.50	4.28	4.37	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1378/1583	3.57	4.35	4.19	4.31	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1402/1532	3.13	4.14	4.01	4.10	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1278/1504	3.38	4.24	4.05	4.29	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	955/1612	4.13	4.54	4.16	4.27	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1441/1635	4.13	4.75	4.65	4.81	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1555/1579	2.50	4.21	4.08	4.17	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1400/1518	3.63	4.70	4.43	4.49	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1392/1520	4.13	4.70	4.70	4.79	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1488/1517	2.75	4.42	4.27	4.32	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1328/1550	3.50	4.54	4.22	4.23	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	783/1295	3.83	3.93	3.94	3.95	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.75	4.07	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.61	3.93	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.74	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****

```
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 37  ****  ****  4.58  4.33  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 32  ****  ****  4.56  4.59  ****

                           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 50  ****  ****  4.45  4.39  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal        7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 32  ****  ****  4.51  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful          7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 43  ****  ****  4.69  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful           7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 32  ****  ****  4.37  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students         7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 21  ****  ****  4.52  4.42  ****
```

Course-Section: STAT 619 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1607
Title   BIOSTATISTICS   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 651 0101   University of Maryland   Page 1608
Title   BASIC PROBABILITY   Baltimore County   FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON   Fall   2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 17
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  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  366/1639    4.71  4.34  4.27  4.42  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  583/1639    4.46  4.46  4.22  4.26  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  383/1397    4.64  4.50  4.28  4.37  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  4  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  323/1583    4.67  4.35  4.19  4.31  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  216/1532    4.69  4.14  4.01  4.10  4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0  0  0  3  8  4.73  202/1504    4.73  4.24  4.05  4.29  4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93   90/1612    4.93  4.54  4.16  4.27  4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  6  8  4.57 1087/1635    4.57  4.75  4.65  4.81  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5  6  4.55  342/1579    4.55  4.21  4.08  4.17  4.55

                        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  286/1518    4.86  4.70  4.43  4.49  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1520    5.00  4.70  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0  0  1  4  9  4.57  510/1517    4.57  4.42  4.27  4.32  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  231/1550    4.86  4.54  4.22  4.23  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0  0  0  3  9  4.75  135/1295    4.75  3.93  3.94  3.95  4.75

                        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0  2  3  6  4.08  742/1398    4.08  3.75  4.07  4.22  4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0  0  4  8  4.67  489/1391    4.67  3.95  4.30  4.47  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 2  2  8  4.50  647/1388    4.50  4.01  4.28  4.49  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  9  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 958   ****  3.61  3.93  4.01  ****

                        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 52   ****  ****  4.04  3.64  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 53   ****  ****  4.05  4.03  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 37   ****  ****  4.58  4.33  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 32   ****  ****  4.56  4.59  ****

                        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 50   ****  ****  4.45  4.39  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 32   ****  ****  4.51  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 43   ****  ****  4.69  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 32   ****  ****  4.37  4.31  ****
```

```
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.52  4.42  ****
```

<div align="center">Frequency Distribution</div>

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: STAT 700A 0101              University of Maryland                           Page 1609
Title           CROSSOVER DESIGNS BIOE      Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     MATHEW, THOMAS              Fall    2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires: 2                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.35	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.54	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.21	4.08	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.54	4.22	4.23	5.00

<div align="center">Frequency Distribution</div>

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	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 700B 0101              University of Maryland                           Page 1610
Title           STATISTICAL DATA MININ      Baltimore County                                FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     PARK, JUNYONG               Fall    2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires: 7                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	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	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	163/1639	4.86	4.46	4.22	4.26	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	881/1583	4.17	4.35	4.19	4.31	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	203/1532	4.71	4.14	4.01	4.10	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	208/1504	4.71	4.24	4.05	4.29	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	934/1612	4.14	4.54	4.16	4.27	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	736/1635	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.81	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.21	4.08	4.17	4.50

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor 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	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.70	4.43	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	961/1520	4.71	4.70	4.70	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.54	4.22	4.23	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	329/1295	4.43	3.93	3.94	3.95	4.43

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	3.75	4.07	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	3.95	4.30	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.01	4.28	4.49	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	3.61	3.93	4.01	4.50

Laboratory

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	3.96	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.74	****

Seminar

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.37	****

Field Work

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****

Self Paced

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.39	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101　　University of Maryland　　Page 1610
Title　　STATISTICAL DATA MININ　　Baltimore County　　FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:　PARK, JUNYONG　　Fall　2007　　Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:　　8
Questionnaires:　7　　Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	4	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 710　0101　　University of Maryland　　Page 1611
Title　　TOP:MATH STAT/STAT INF　　Baltimore County　　FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:　SINHA, BIMAL　　Fall　2007　　Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:　　5
Questionnaires:　5　　Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.46	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.37	****

4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.35	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.54	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.75	4.65	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.21	4.08	4.17	5.00

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.54	4.22	4.23	5.00

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.75	4.07	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.49	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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