```
Course-Section: STAT 121  01                University of Maryland                              Page 1396
Title       Intro Statistics:Soc S          Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil                 Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     69
Questionnaires: 54                  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   6  18  11  17  3.65 1296/1447  3.80  4.33  4.31 4.18  3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   2   5  15  18  14  3.69 1254/1447  4.09  4.35  4.27 4.30  3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   1   4  11  17  20  3.96  949/1241  4.22  4.42  4.33 4.25  3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2  24   1   1   8   9   9  3.86 1107/1402  3.97  4.30  4.24 4.15  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  10   1   4   6  13  19  4.05  777/1358  3.99  4.19  4.11 4.03  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  43   0   1   1   4   4  4.10 ****/1316  3.91  4.27  4.14 3.99  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   1   0   7  15  30  4.38  632/1427  4.35  4.28  4.19 4.24  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1   0   0   1   4  47  4.88  538/1447  4.51  4.69  4.69 4.68  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11  2   0   2  15  14  10  3.78 1066/1434  4.00  4.11  4.10 4.10  3.78


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0   1   1   8  15  26  4.25 1039/1387  4.43  4.60  4.46 4.46  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0   0   3   3  22  23  4.27 1252/1387  4.40  4.68  4.73 4.71  4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  5   0   2   3   8  17  19  3.98 1071/1386  4.24  4.32  4.32 4.32  3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4   0   5   4   5  12  24  3.92 1089/1380  4.18  4.39  4.32 4.31  3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  39   0   1   2   4   4  4.00 ****/1193  4.23  3.95  4.02 3.99  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6   0  12   7   8  11  10  3.00 1090/1172  3.60  3.90  4.15 3.95  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7   0   8   4  10   9  16  3.45 1094/1182  3.84  4.06  4.35 4.18  3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6   0   5   5  14   9  15  3.50 1070/1170  3.85  4.15  4.38 4.17  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  33   2   0   4   6   3  3.53  647/ 800  3.67  4.12  4.06 3.95  3.53


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 53   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.18  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 53   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 53   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          53   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.37  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 53   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 3.95  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 53   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.08  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 3.88  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 3.78  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.75  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49 3.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25 4.26  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52 3.84  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.50  4.30 3.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43 3.73  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 53   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72 4.50  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   53   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57 4.38  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     53   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64 4.65  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      53   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60 4.49  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    53   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61 4.31  ****
```

```
                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     6          0.00-0.99   0       A   17        Required for Majors  32     Graduate     0      Major        0
 28-55    15          1.00-1.99   0       B   21
 56-83     8          2.00-2.99   8       C   11        General              15     Under-grad  54      Non-major   54
 84-150    6          3.00-3.49   9       D    1
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00  20       F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  04              University of Maryland                              Page 1397
Title       Intro Statistics:Soc S        Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Kegan,Bonnie E              Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   138
Questionnaires:  39                  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  0 10 13 14  3.95 1118/1447  3.80  4.33  4.31  4.18  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  5  7 26  4.49  561/1447   4.09  4.35  4.27  4.30  4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  5  7 25  4.47  576/1241   4.22  4.42  4.33  4.25  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4  1  4  2 12 16  4.09  923/1402   3.97  4.30  4.24  4.15  4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5  3  1  6  9 15  3.94  869/1358   3.99  4.19  4.11  4.03  3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4  2  3  7  7 16  3.91  900/1316   3.91  4.27  4.14  3.99  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  3  2  9 23  4.32  704/1427   4.35  4.28  4.19  4.24  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  1  1 29  8  4.13 1321/1447  4.51  4.69  4.69  4.68  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  0  1  5 13 14  4.21  679/1434   4.00  4.11  4.10  4.10  4.21


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  3  9 26  4.61  656/1387   4.43  4.60  4.46  4.46  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  1  3  9 25  4.53 1125/1387  4.40  4.68  4.73  4.71  4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  5  9 24  4.50  607/1386   4.24  4.32  4.32  4.32  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  1  1  2 10 24  4.45  719/1380   4.18  4.39  4.32  4.31  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3  1  1  5 10 18  4.23  501/1193   4.23  3.95  4.02  3.99  4.23


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  3  1  6 11  4.19  619/1172   3.60  3.90  4.15  3.95  4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  1  1  3  3 13  4.24  746/1182   3.84  4.06  4.35  4.18  4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19  0  1  0  4  4 11  4.20  798/1170   3.85  4.15  4.38  4.17  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                   19  4  1  2  2  5  6  3.81  557/ 800   3.67  4.12  4.06  3.95  3.81


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   34  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.18  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 34 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34  4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            35  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.37  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  35  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.29  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 36  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  3.95  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 36 1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.08  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 36  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  3.88  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     36  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  3.78  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 36  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.75  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  36  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49  3.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  36  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25  4.26  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        36  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52  3.84  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    36  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  30  ****  4.50  4.30  3.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  36  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43  3.73  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72  4.50  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     35  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57  4.38  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       35  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64  4.65  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        35  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60  4.49  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      35  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61  4.31  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  01                    University of Maryland                                  Page 1398
Title      Stat W/App In Biol Sci               Baltimore County                                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Jacobs,Justin W                    Spring 2010                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    90
Questionnaires:  56                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  3  8 45  4.75  309/1447  4.23  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1 13 42  4.73  270/1447  4.37  4.35  4.27  4.23  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1 13 41  4.73  313/1241  4.50  4.42  4.33  4.33  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  10  1  2  4 12 27  4.35  675/1402  4.31  4.30  4.24  4.24  4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10  5  1 13 11 16  3.70 1063/1358  3.96  4.19  4.11  4.10  3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 23 2  1  4  9 16  4.13  738/1316  4.17  4.27  4.14  4.13  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  8 47  4.82  140/1427  4.41  4.28  4.19  4.15  4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2 54  4.96  194/1447  4.93  4.69  4.69  4.65  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2 1 0  0 11 32  4.66  238/1434  4.13  4.11  4.10  4.09  4.66


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0 15 41  4.73  460/1387  4.39  4.60  4.46  4.44  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  4 52  4.93  422/1387  4.55  4.68  4.73  4.71  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3 14 39  4.64  457/1386  4.16  4.32  4.32  4.30  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  5 50  4.91  159/1380  4.35  4.39  4.32  4.32  4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 40 1  2  2  3  5  3.69 ****/1193  3.69  3.95  4.02  4.05  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  7  1  9  6 15  3.55  978/1172  3.54  3.90  4.15  4.24  3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0  6  2  9  7 14  3.55 1065/1182  3.46  4.06  4.35  4.42  3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 2  1  6  7 22  4.21  787/1170  3.96  4.15  4.38  4.49  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  17  31  0  1  3  1  3  3.75 ****/ 800  3.57  4.12  4.06  4.12  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  54   1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 54 0 1 0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34  4.20  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           54   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 54   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.02  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 55   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49  4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 55   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25  3.81  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 55 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    55   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      55   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       55   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     55   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61  5.00  ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2       0.00-0.99    0      A   39      Required for Majors  48     Graduate     0      Major       1
28-55      6       1.00-1.99    0      B   12
56-83     12       2.00-2.99    5      C    2      General               0     Under-grad  56      Non-major  55
84-150     9       3.00-3.49   11      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   13      F    0      Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 2
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  04                    University of Maryland                              Page 1399
Title        Stat W/App In Biol Sci              Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Slowikowski,Wil                     Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      62
Questionnaires:  40                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  3  4 16  17  4.18   945/1447   4.23  4.33  4.31  4.32  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  1  2 11  26  4.55   479/1447   4.37  4.35  4.27  4.23  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1  0  3  8  28  4.55   496/1241   4.50  4.42  4.33  4.33  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0  0  4 14  18  4.39   635/1402   4.31  4.30  4.24  4.24  4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   2  5  6  8  14  3.77  1008/1358   3.96  4.19  4.11  4.10  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0  2  6  5  14  4.15   719/1316   4.17  4.27  4.14  4.13  4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  4  8  28  4.60   337/1427   4.41  4.28  4.19  4.15  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  2  38  4.95   291/1447   4.93  4.69  4.69  4.65  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1  0  1  2 14  12  4.28   611/1434   4.13  4.11  4.10  4.09  4.28


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  1  2  6  31  4.68   551/1387   4.39  4.60  4.46  4.44  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  0  3 13  23  4.51  1134/1387   4.55  4.68  4.73  4.71  4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0  2  3 13  21  4.36   793/1386   4.16  4.32  4.32  4.30  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0  1  5  6  27  4.51   648/1380   4.35  4.39  4.32  4.32  4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 22  3  0  4  3   8  3.72   861/1193   3.69  3.95  4.02  4.05  3.72


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   4  2  9  3  19  3.84   841/1172   3.54  3.90  4.15  4.24  3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   2  5 10  7  13  3.65  1042/1182   3.46  4.06  4.35  4.42  3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0   0  3  6 11  15  4.09   853/1170   3.96  4.15  4.38  4.49  4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  23   2  2  2  2   6  3.57   637/ 800   3.57  4.12  4.06  4.12  3.57

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 39 0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00  ****/  31   **** 4.63  4.72  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    39  0   0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  21   **** 4.50  4.57  5.00  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3          0.00-0.99   0     A  21       Required for Majors  32      Graduate      0       Major        0
28-55      7          1.00-1.99   0     B  11
56-83      8          2.00-2.99   6     C   1       General               2      Under-grad   40       Non-major   40
84-150     4          3.00-3.49  10     D   0
Grad.      0          3.50-4.00   8     F   0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                 0
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  07              University of Maryland                          Page 1400
Title          Stat W/App In Biol Sci     Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Huang,Yi                   Spring 2010                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    58
Questionnaires: 39                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies    Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  2  1 13 10 12  3.76 1253/1447  4.23  4.33  4.31 4.32  3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  5  7 12 13  3.82 1203/1447  4.37  4.35  4.27 4.23  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  1  1  5 13 18  4.21  814/1241  4.50  4.42  4.33 4.33  4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  13  1  1  4  5 14  4.20  827/1402  4.31  4.30  4.24 4.24  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   2  0  0  7  7 21  4.40  452/1358  3.96  4.19  4.11 4.10  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 16  1  1  2  5 12  4.24  635/1316  4.17  4.27  4.14 4.13  4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  2  5  5 11 14  3.81 1137/1427  4.41  4.28  4.19 4.15  3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  5 32  4.86  592/1447  4.93  4.69  4.69 4.65  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1  2  2 13  8  6  3.45 1257/1434  4.13  4.11  4.10 4.09  3.45


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  3  2  7 10 12  3.76 1260/1387  4.39  4.60  4.46 4.44  3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  1  1  3 14 15  4.21 1280/1387  4.55  4.68  4.73 4.71  4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  4  4  9  6 11  3.47 1265/1386  4.16  4.32  4.32 4.30  3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   1  6  2  2 10 12  3.63 1211/1380  4.35  4.39  4.32 4.32  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  4  5  2  4  6 13  3.67  895/1193  3.69  3.95  4.02 4.05  3.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  6  2  4  3  8  3.22 1065/1172  3.54  3.90  4.15 4.24  3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  5  5  3  3  8  3.17 1130/1182  3.46  4.06  4.35 4.42  3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  2  3  7  3  9  3.58 1039/1170  3.96  4.15  4.38 4.49  3.58
4. Were special techniques successful                   16 16  1  2  0  2  2  3.29 ****/ 800  3.57  4.12  4.06 4.12  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   35  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 36 0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 36 2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            36  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  36  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20 4.02  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 37  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 37 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 37  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     37  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 37  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.38  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49 4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52 4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  4.50  4.30 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43 4.50  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     38  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       37  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        37  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      37  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61 5.00  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: STAT 351  01                 University of Maryland                            Page 1401
Title        Applied Stat/Bus & Eco          Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Dasgupta,Nandit                 Spring 2010                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     97
Questionnaires:  64                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  3  4 11 46  4.56  518/1447  4.23  4.33  4.31 4.32  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  9 54  4.83  179/1447  4.55  4.35  4.27 4.23  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  9 54  4.83  213/1241  4.63  4.42  4.33 4.33  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3  11  0  0  3 12 35  4.64  336/1402  4.32  4.30  4.24 4.24  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 15  1  1  6 13 27  4.33  529/1358  4.11  4.19  4.11 4.10  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 24 1  1  6 10 20  4.24  635/1316  4.08  4.27  4.14 4.13  4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  2  9 51  4.69  265/1427  4.47  4.28  4.19 4.15  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  1  9 43 11  4.00 1361/1447  4.46  4.69  4.69 4.65  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 5 1 0  2 13 26  4.50  341/1434  4.15  4.11  4.10 4.09  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  8 53  4.84  307/1387  4.67  4.60  4.46 4.44  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  5 56  4.89  579/1387  4.75  4.68  4.73 4.71  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  2 11 48  4.75  316/1386  4.47  4.32  4.32 4.30  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  1  1  9 50  4.71  406/1380  4.48  4.39  4.32 4.32  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 39 2 1  0  6 13  4.23  501/1193  3.97  3.95  4.02 4.05  4.23


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  4  5  4 19 29  4.05  694/1172  4.01  3.90  4.15 4.24  4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  3  4  7 13 33  4.15  796/1182  3.98  4.06  4.35 4.42  4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1  4  9 14 32  4.20  798/1170  3.97  4.15  4.38 4.49  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  38  2  1  4  6  8  3.81  562/ 800  3.81  4.12  4.06 4.12  3.81


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  53  3  0  0  0  5  3  4.38 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 54 0 1 0  1  2  6  4.20 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 54 4 0 0  1  2  3  4.33 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           54  3  0  0  1  2  4  4.43 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 54  5  1  0  0  1  3  4.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20 4.02  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 58 4 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 60 2 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 60 2 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    59  3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                60  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.38  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59  0  2  0  1  0  2  3.00 ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49 4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 60  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       60  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52 4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   60  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  30  ****  4.50  4.30 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 60  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43 4.50  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 1  0  0  1  3  4.00 ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    60  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      60  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       60  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     60  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61 5.00  ****
```

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	30	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	64	Non-major	64
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Questionnaires: 39   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  8 16 12  3.90 1166/1447  4.23  4.33  4.31 4.32  3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  2  5 12 19  4.26  843/1447  4.55  4.35  4.27 4.23  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  2  1 13 21  4.43  622/1241  4.63  4.42  4.33 4.33  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  0  3  9  8 15  4.00  976/1402  4.32  4.30  4.24 4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  1  5  5 10 14  3.89  931/1358  4.11  4.19  4.11 4.10  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 1  3  6  5 13  3.93  890/1316  4.08  4.27  4.14 4.13  3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  1  2  4  9 20  4.25  775/1427  4.47  4.28  4.19 4.15  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   4  0  0  1  1 32  4.91  436/1447  4.46  4.69  4.69 4.65  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 6 0 1  7  7  5  3.80 1052/1434  4.15  4.11  4.10 4.09  3.80


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       13   0  0  0  3  7 16  4.50  798/1387  4.67  4.60  4.46 4.44  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  13   0  0  0  2  6 18  4.62 1042/1387  4.75  4.68  4.73 4.71  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0  3  2  8 13  4.19  927/1386  4.47  4.32  4.32 4.30  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12   0  0  0  6  8 13  4.26  887/1380  4.48  4.39  4.32 4.32  4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 8 2 1  5  1  8  3.71  874/1193  3.97  3.95  4.02 4.05  3.71


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 2  1  5  7 12  3.96  746/1172  4.01  3.90  4.15 4.24  3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 2  3  5  5 12  3.81  990/1182  3.98  4.06  4.35 4.42  3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 3 1  7  5 11  3.74  991/1170  3.97  4.15  4.38 4.49  3.74
4. Were special techniques successful                 12  19  1  0  1  3  3  3.88 ****/ 800  3.81  4.12  4.06 4.12  ****


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 38 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.20  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.17  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49 4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      38   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52 4.46  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   38   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     38   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      38   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    38   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61 5.00  ****
```

                                   Frequency Distribution


```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2        0.00-0.99   0      A   14        Required for Majors  21      Graduate     0       Major       0
28-55      6        1.00-1.99   0      B   11
56-83      2        2.00-2.99   5      C    2        General               0      Under-grad  39       Non-major  39
84-150     5        3.00-3.49   7      D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   2      F    0        Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                 0
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  01                    University of Maryland                           Page 1403
Title          Intro App Prob & Stat            Baltimore County                                JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Simko,Michael J                  Spring 2010                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    70
Questionnaires: 34                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                           NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  6  2 10  9  6  3.21 1387/1447  3.67  4.33  4.31 4.32  3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  5  4 10  9  6  3.21 1378/1447  3.79  4.35  4.27 4.23  3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  3  5  6  9 11  3.59 1121/1241  4.03  4.42  4.33 4.33  3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  4  5  9  6  7  3.23 1337/1402  3.80  4.30  4.24 4.24  3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  4  5  4 10 11  3.56 1147/1358  3.72  4.19  4.11 4.10  3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11 6  4  8  3  2  2.61 1294/1316  3.35  4.27  4.14 4.13  2.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  3  6  4 10  9  3.50 1259/1427  4.02  4.28  4.19 4.15  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  1 31  4.91  485/1447  4.89  4.69  4.69 4.65  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 7  6 11  3  2  2.55 1403/1434  3.23  4.11  4.10 4.09  2.55


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  3  2  7  6 16  3.88 1233/1387  4.21  4.60  4.46 4.44  3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  3  4  2 11 14  3.85 1343/1387  4.38  4.68  4.73 4.71  3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  7  4  8 11  4  3.03 1327/1386  3.70  4.32  4.32 4.30  3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  9  3 10  6  6  2.91 1326/1380  3.53  4.39  4.32 4.32  2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 24 5  0  2  3  0  2.30 1170/1193  3.22  3.95  4.02 4.05  2.30


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  6  3  3 12  8  3.41 1024/1172  3.29  3.90  4.15 4.24  3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  4  2  3 14  9  3.69 1032/1182  3.49  4.06  4.35 4.42  3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  4  1  6 12  9  3.66 1016/1170  3.65  4.15  4.38 4.49  3.66
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  28  2  0  2  0  0  2.00 ****/ 800  ****  4.12  4.06 4.12  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  31  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 1 0  2  0  0  2.33 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 1 0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           31  1  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31  1  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20 4.02  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 1 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    31  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                31  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.38  ****


            Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       33  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52 4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   33  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.50  4.30 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43 4.50  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 32 0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    32  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      32  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       32  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     32  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61 5.00  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   8   Required for Majors 30   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   11
56-83   4   2.00-2.99   4   C   9   General   0   Under-grad   34   Non-major   34
84-150   5   3.00-3.49   6   D   1
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   6   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0   responses to be significant
                                     I   0   Other   0
                                     ?   1

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  04                    University of Maryland                              Page 1404
Title          Intro App Prob & Stat             Baltimore County                                  JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Glezen,John                       Spring 2010                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    65
Questionnaires: 32                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  9  6 16  4.13   989/1447  3.67  4.33  4.31 4.32  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  3  8 19  4.38   715/1447  3.79  4.35  4.27 4.23  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2 10 19  4.47   587/1241  4.03  4.42  4.33 4.33  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  4 12 16  4.38   645/1402  3.80  4.30  4.24 4.24  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  2  2  3  7 10  3.88   938/1358  3.72  4.19  4.11 4.10  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8  0  0  7  8  9  4.08   768/1316  3.35  4.27  4.14 4.13  4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  2  8 21  4.53   422/1427  4.02  4.28  4.19 4.15  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  2 29  4.88   565/1447  4.89  4.69  4.69 4.65  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1  1  0  6 10  7  3.92   969/1434  3.23  4.11  4.10 4.09  3.92

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  2 11 19  4.53   755/1387  4.21  4.60  4.46 4.44  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  3 29  4.91   528/1387  4.38  4.68  4.73 4.71  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  4  9 18  4.38   775/1386  3.70  4.32  4.32 4.30  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  2  3  7 18  4.16   965/1380  3.53  4.39  4.32 4.32  4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  9  0  2  2 10  9  4.13   583/1193  3.22  3.95  4.02 4.05  4.13

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  5  0  2  7  3  3.18  1071/1172  3.29  3.90  4.15 4.24  3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  2  1  6  6  2  3.29  1117/1182  3.49  4.06  4.35 4.42  3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  3  1  2  4  7  3.65  1019/1170  3.65  4.15  4.38 4.49  3.65
4. Were special techniques successful                   15 11  0  0  1  4  1  4.00  ****/ 800  ****  4.12  4.06 4.12  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   29  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            30  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  30  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20 4.02  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.38  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       1    0.00-0.99    0      A   18        Required for Majors  23      Graduate     0      Major        0
28-55       0    1.00-1.99    0      B   12
56-83       6    2.00-2.99    1      C    2        General               1      Under-grad  32      Non-major   32
84-150      7    3.00-3.49    5      D    0
Grad.       0    3.50-4.00   10      F    0        Electives             4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                     I    0        Other                 2
                                     ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 405  01                University of Maryland                              Page 1405
Title       Survey Sampling                 Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Mathew,Thomas                   Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 16                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  0  4 11  4.56   518/1447  4.56  4.33  4.31  4.43  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  3 11  4.50   532/1447  4.50  4.35  4.27  4.31  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  2  5  8  4.19   833/1241  4.19  4.42  4.33  4.41  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  2  0  1  3  8  4.07   929/1402  4.07  4.30  4.24  4.34  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  0  2  4  8  4.20   663/1358  4.20  4.19  4.11  4.15  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1  0  1  3  9  4.36   534/1316  4.36  4.27  4.14  4.27  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  0  4 11  4.50   459/1427  4.50  4.28  4.19  4.20  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  0  3 12  4.56  1042/1447  4.56  4.69  4.69  4.72  4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0  0  0  3  8  4.73   182/1434  4.73  4.11  4.10  4.17  4.73


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  0  1 13  4.73   460/1387  4.73  4.60  4.46  4.48  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  0  1 14  4.75   859/1387  4.75  4.68  4.73  4.76  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  0  2 13  4.69   405/1386  4.69  4.32  4.32  4.34  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  0  2 13  4.63   520/1380  4.63  4.39  4.32  4.34  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 2  0  0  0  7  4.11   602/1193  4.11  3.95  4.02  4.00  4.11


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0  1  0  2  3  4.17   637/1172  4.17  3.90  4.15  4.25  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0  1  0  2  3  4.17   788/1182  4.17  4.06  4.35  4.49  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 1  0  1  4  4.33   710/1170  4.33  4.15  4.38  4.51  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   2  1  0  0  0  3  4.00   423/ 800  4.00  4.12  4.06  4.19  4.00


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.74  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1  0  0  1  3.50  ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.72  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.59  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.53  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 0 1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.87  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.80  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  4.59  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  4.43  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49  4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52  4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  30  ****  4.50  4.30  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43  4.62  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0  1  0  0  1  3.50  ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72  4.80  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64  4.60  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

```
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires:  5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   254/1447  4.80  4.33  4.31  4.43  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   677/1447  4.40  4.35  4.27  4.31  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   658/1241  4.40  4.42  4.33  4.41  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   380/1402  4.60  4.30  4.24  4.34  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   799/1358  4.00  4.19  4.11  4.15  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  2  2  4.20   671/1316  4.20  4.27  4.14  4.27  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  4  0  3.80  1144/1427  3.80  4.28  4.19  4.20  3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20  1286/1447  4.20  4.69  4.69  4.72  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  1  4  0  3.80  1052/1434  3.80  4.11  4.10  4.17  3.80


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   353/1387  4.80  4.60  4.46  4.48  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  1282/1387  4.20  4.68  4.73  4.76  4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80  1174/1386  3.80  4.32  4.32  4.34  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   549/1380  4.60  4.39  4.32  4.34  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  5  0  4.00   652/1193  4.00  3.95  4.02  4.00  4.00
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 453  01          University of Maryland                              Page 1407
Title      Intro Mathematical Sta       Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Stanwyck,Elizab           Spring 2010                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   21
Questionnaires: 20              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  3  17  4.85   201/1447   4.85  4.33  4.31  4.43  4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  17  4.85   154/1447   4.85  4.35  4.27  4.31  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  1  19  4.95    85/1241   4.95  4.42  4.33  4.41  4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  11  0  0  0  0   9  5.00     1/1402   5.00  4.30  4.24  4.34  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  0  1  2  3   6  4.17   690/1358   4.17  4.19  4.11  4.15  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13 0 0 0 0  7  5.00     1/1316   5.00  4.27  4.14  4.27  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  2  18  4.90    86/1427   4.90  4.28  4.19  4.20  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  1  19  4.95   291/1447   4.95  4.69  4.69  4.72  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 4 15  4.79   133/1434   4.79  4.11  4.10  4.17  4.79


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  1  2  17  4.80   353/1387   4.80  4.60  4.46  4.48  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  20  5.00     1/1387   5.00  4.68  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 16  4.75   316/1386   4.75  4.32  4.32  4.34  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  2  18  4.90   159/1380   4.90  4.39  4.32  4.34  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 15 0 0 0 1 2  4.67  ****/1193   ****  3.95  4.02  4.00  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1  3  4.75  ****/1172   ****  3.90  4.15  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 0 0 0 0  4  5.00  ****/1182   ****  4.06  4.35  4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0 0  3  5.00  ****/1170   ****  4.15  4.38  4.51  ****


                                Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0       A   10       Required for Majors  7       Graduate    1       Major        2
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B    3                                                        
  56-83      1       2.00-2.99    0       C    1       General              0       Under-grad  19      Non-major   18
  84-150    10       3.00-3.49    6       D    0                                                        
  Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    6       F    0       Electives            6       #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                1
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 470  01                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1408
Title          Prob Actuarial Science             Baltimore County                                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Meskin,Stephen                       Spring 2010                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  6                       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   2  4.33   790/1447  4.33  4.33  4.31 4.43  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3   2  4.17   938/1447  4.17  4.35  4.27 4.31  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   380/1241  4.67  4.42  4.33 4.41  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   1   1   2  4.25   766/1402  4.25  4.30  4.24 4.34  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   2   0   3  4.20   663/1358  4.20  4.19  4.11 4.15  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0   0   1   0   3  4.50   392/1316  4.50  4.27  4.14 4.27  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   3   1   0   1   1   0  2.67  1388/1427  2.67  4.28  4.19 4.20  2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67   958/1447  4.67  4.69  4.69 4.72  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   1   4   1  4.00   849/1434  4.00  4.11  4.10 4.17  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67   566/1387  4.67  4.60  4.46 4.48  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1387  5.00  4.68  4.73 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83   217/1386  4.83  4.32  4.32 4.34  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50   659/1380  4.50  4.39  4.32 4.34  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5  0   0   0   0   1  5.00   ****/1193  ****  3.95  4.02 4.00  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   377/1172  4.50  3.90  4.15 4.25  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1182  5.00  4.06  4.35 4.49  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1170  5.00  4.15  4.38 4.51  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 601  01                 University of Maryland                                  Page 1409
Title      Applied Statistics I              Baltimore County                                       JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Klein,Martin D                 Spring 2010                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 16                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  2  1  0  4  9  4.06 1027/1447  4.06  4.33  4.31 4.46  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  3  2  1  3  7  3.56 1300/1447  3.56  4.35  4.27 4.30  3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  2  4  0  9  3.88 1008/1241  3.88  4.42  4.33 4.38  3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  1  3  3  1  7  3.67 1203/1402  3.67  4.30  4.24 4.29  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 3 6 6  4.20  663/1358  4.20  4.19  4.11 4.26  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 3 0 6 6 4.00  812/1316  4.00  4.27  4.14 4.34  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  2  2  3  2  7  3.63 1219/1427  3.63  4.28  4.19 4.25  3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  339/1447  4.94  4.69  4.69 4.74  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 2 2 0 3 2 3.11 1338/1434  3.11  4.11  4.10 4.21  3.11


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  1 14  4.81  337/1387  4.81  4.60  4.46 4.51  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2  2 12  4.63 1030/1387  4.63  4.68  4.73 4.81  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 1 2 10  4.06 1022/1386  4.06  4.32  4.32 4.43  4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  3  0  3  1  9  3.81 1148/1380  3.81  4.39  4.32 4.38  3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 0 0 0 1 7  4.88   75/1193  4.88  3.95  4.02 4.02  4.88


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 1 4  4.33  521/1172  4.33  3.90  4.15 4.32  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 0 1 4  4.33  691/1182  4.33  4.06  4.35 4.46  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50  576/1170  4.50  4.15  4.38 4.52  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  1  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  159/ 800  4.60  4.12  4.06 4.10  4.60


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.82  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34 4.79  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.73  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.67  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20 4.55  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 4.75  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.64  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 4.18  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00    1/  38  5.00  4.63  4.49 4.77  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  36  5.00  4.63  4.25 4.39  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  28  5.00  4.50  4.52 4.83  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  30  5.00  4.50  4.30 4.66  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  27  5.00  4.50  4.43 4.71  5.00


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00    1/  31  5.00  4.63  4.72 4.85  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  21  5.00  4.50  4.57 4.65  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  31  5.00  4.50  4.64 4.59  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  20  5.00  4.50  4.60 4.56  5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     12  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/  15  5.00  5.00  4.61 4.80  5.00
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   4   0.00-0.99   0   A   6   Required for Majors   9   Graduate   4   Major   11
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   3
56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   0   Under-grad 12   Non-major   5
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   0   D   0
Grad.   4   3.50-4.00   6   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   0
                                        ?   1

Title   Mathematical Stat II   Baltimore County   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Roy,Anindya   Spring 2010   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.42	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.30	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	280/1358	4.60	4.19	4.11	4.26	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	842/1427	4.20	4.28	4.19	4.25	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.69	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.11	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	902/1387	4.40	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1380	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.90	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.06	4.35	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.15	4.38	4.52	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.12	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 619  01                University of Maryland                           Page 1411
Title       Biostatistics                   Baltimore County                                JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Huang,Yi                       Spring 2010                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  9                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  169/1447  4.89  4.33  4.31  4.46  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  352/1447  4.67  4.35  4.27  4.30  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  541/1241  4.50  4.42  4.33  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  358/1402  4.63  4.30  4.24  4.29  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  158/1358  4.78  4.19  4.11  4.26  4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  150/1316  4.78  4.27  4.14  4.34  4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  398/1427  4.56  4.28  4.19  4.25  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  958/1447  4.67  4.69  4.69  4.74  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0  1  0  5  1  3.86 1017/1434  3.86  4.11  4.10  4.21  3.86


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  230/1387  4.89  4.60  4.46  4.51  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  579/1387  4.89  4.68  4.73  4.81  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  6  3  4.33  811/1386  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.43  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  463/1380  4.67  4.39  4.32  4.38  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  186/1193  4.67  3.95  4.02  4.02  4.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  203/1172  4.78  3.90  4.15  4.32  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  219/1182  4.89  4.06  4.35  4.46  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  508/1170  4.63  4.15  4.38  4.52  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   4  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  159/ 800  4.60  4.12  4.06  4.10  4.60


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.82  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34  4.79  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.73  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.67  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.55  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  4.75  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.64  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  4.18  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  38  ****  4.63  4.49  4.77  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  36  ****  4.63  4.25  4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  28  ****  4.50  4.52  4.83  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  30  ****  4.50  4.30  4.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  27  ****  4.50  4.43  4.71  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  31  ****  4.63  4.72  4.85  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  21  ****  4.50  4.57  4.65  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  31  ****  4.50  4.64  4.59  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  20  ****  4.50  4.60  4.56  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61  4.80  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 621  01                   University of Maryland                                Page 1412
Title          Prob Thry/Stoch Proc I          Baltimore County                                     JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Rathinam,Muruha                 Spring 2010                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
Questionnaires: 4                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   2   2  4.50   585/1447  4.50  4.33  4.31  4.46  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   249/1447  4.75  4.35  4.27  4.30  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   282/1241  4.75  4.42  4.33  4.38  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1402  5.00  4.30  4.24  4.29  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   237/1358  4.67  4.19  4.11  4.26  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   166/1316  4.75  4.27  4.14  4.34  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   200/1427  4.75  4.28  4.19  4.25  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1447  5.00  4.69  4.69  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   158/1434  4.75  4.11  4.10  4.21  4.75

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   429/1387  4.75  4.60  4.46  4.51  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1387  5.00  4.68  4.73  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1386  5.00  4.32  4.32  4.43  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1380  5.00  4.39  4.32  4.38  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/1193  5.00  3.95  4.02  4.02  5.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   710/1172  4.00  3.90  4.15  4.32  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   856/1182  4.00  4.06  4.35  4.46  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   864/1170  4.00  4.15  4.38  4.52  4.00
```

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 653  01               University of Maryland                           Page 1413
Title        Basic Math Stat                 Baltimore County                             JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Park,Junyong                    Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  18
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   2   0   0  12  4.57   507/1447  4.57  4.33  4.31  4.46  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   2  10  4.50   532/1447  4.50  4.35  4.27  4.30  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   1   1  11  4.50   541/1241  4.50  4.42  4.33  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   1   0   1   2   8  4.33   685/1402  4.33  4.30  4.24  4.29  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   0   2   1   9  4.31   563/1358  4.31  4.19  4.11  4.26  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1   0   0   3   9  4.46   434/1316  4.46  4.27  4.14  4.34  4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   0   1  12  4.64   301/1427  4.64  4.28  4.19  4.25  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   1   0   0   4   9  4.43  1139/1447  4.43  4.69  4.69  4.74  4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0   0   0   3   6  4.67   230/1434  4.67  4.11  4.10  4.21  4.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   0   0  12  4.77   414/1387  4.77  4.60  4.46  4.51  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   1   0   0  12  4.77   844/1387  4.77  4.68  4.73  4.81  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   1   3   8  4.38   766/1386  4.38  4.32  4.32  4.43  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   0   1   1  10  4.46   699/1380  4.46  4.39  4.32  4.38  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3  3   0   0   0   6  3.67   895/1193  3.67  3.95  4.02  4.02  3.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0   1   0   1   1  3.67  ****/1172  ****  3.90  4.15  4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0   1   1   0   1  3.33  ****/1182  ****  4.06  4.35  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0   1   1   0   1  3.33  ****/1170  ****  4.15  4.38  4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   0  1   0   0   1   1  3.33  ****/ 800  ****  4.12  4.06  4.10  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11   0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.82  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0  1   0   0   2  4.00  ****/ 192  ****  ****  4.34  4.79  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.73  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.67  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.55  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  4.75  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.64  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  4.18  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10   0  0   1   0   0   3  4.25    30/  38  4.25  4.63  4.49  4.77  4.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10   0  0   1   0   0   3  4.25    20/  36  4.25  4.63  4.25  4.39  4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10   0  1   0   0   0   3  4.00    26/  28  4.00  4.50  4.52  4.83  4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10   0  1   0   0   0   3  4.00    22/  30  4.00  4.50  4.30  4.66  4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10   0  1   0   0   0   3  4.00    22/  27  4.00  4.50  4.43  4.71  4.00


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10  0  0   1   0   0   3  4.25    27/  31  4.25  4.63  4.72  4.85  4.25
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10   0  1   0   0   0   3  4.00    17/  21  4.00  4.50  4.57  4.65  4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10   0  1   0   0   0   3  4.00    26/  31  4.00  4.50  4.64  4.59  4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10   0  1   0   0   0   3  4.00    17/  20  4.00  4.50  4.60  4.56  4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  ****/  15  ****  5.00  4.61  4.80  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 700  01                University of Maryland                              Page 1414
Title         Top:Stat Mthd/Data Ana        Baltimore County                                    JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Sinha,Bimal K                 Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires: 6                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  222/1447   4.83  4.33  4.31  4.46  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1447   5.00  4.35  4.27  4.30  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1241   5.00  4.42  4.33  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  494/1402   4.50  4.30  4.24  4.29  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1358   5.00  4.19  4.11  4.26  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  292/1316   4.60  4.27  4.14  4.34  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  154/1427   4.80  4.28  4.19  4.25  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50 1079/1447   4.50  4.69  4.69  4.74  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  158/1434   4.75  4.11  4.10  4.21  4.75


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1387   5.00  4.60  4.46  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1387   5.00  4.68  4.73  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1386   5.00  4.32  4.32  4.43  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1380   5.00  4.39  4.32  4.38  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1193   ****  3.95  4.02  4.02  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  881/1172   3.75  3.90  4.15  4.32  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1182   5.00  4.06  4.35  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1170   5.00  4.15  4.38  4.52  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 800   5.00  4.12  4.06  4.10  5.00

                                        Frequency Distribution

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