INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Title Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 42

Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 1109 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	9	8	6		1459/1674		4.07	4.27	4.07	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	13		1001/1674	3.82	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	262/1423		4.38	4.27	4.16	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	2	1	3	3	4		1464/1609		4.12	4.22	4.05	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	5	4	7	3.89	926/1585	3.61	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	3	3	3	3		1499/1535	2.96	4.17	4.08	3.89	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2			197/1651	4.42	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	958/1673	4.81	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	7	9	3	3.57	1344/1656	3.57	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	1004/1586	4.33	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	4	18		1142/1585	4.66	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	4	8	9		1296/1582		4.13	4.26	4.17	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	5	13	4.00	1138/1575	3.93	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	2	2	4	0	4	3.17	1190/1380	3.24	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.17
Discussion	_	^	_	0	4	_	_	2 25	1042/1500	2 04	2 50	4 01	2 76	2 25
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5 3	0	4 2	5	6		1243/1520		3.52	4.01	3.76	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6 7	0		3		3 0	8 7		1297/1515	3.66	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	6	0 13	4 1	1 2	6 0	0			1366/1511 ****/ 994	3.67	3.71	4.27	4.00 3.73	3.28
4. Were special techniques successful	0	13	Τ	4	U	U	3	3.33	/ 994	2.57	3.77	3.94	3.73	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	3.29	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 260	3.40	3.40	4.46	4.41	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	3.00	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
J J														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1109 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	ignificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: SURI, MANIL

Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2005

Baltimore County

Page 1110 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

					ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	4	5	4	1	2 00	1628/1674	3.32	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	6	2		1527/1674	3.82	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	836/1423	4.51	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	3	3	3	3		1541/1609	3.30	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	5	3	2		1329/1585	3.61	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		3	1	2	4	3	2		1386/1535	2.96	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	5	6		1057/1651		4.42	4.18	4.10	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13		778/1673			4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes		0	0	1	6	5	2		1344/1656			4.07		3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	1136/1586	4.33	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11		1002/1585	4.66	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	7		1007/1582			4.26	4.17	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	4	5		1240/1575		4.23	4.27	4.17	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	1	2	5	3.31	1142/1380	3.24	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.31
Discussion	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	4	2		1324/1520	3.24	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	5	4	4		1191/1515	3.66	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0 1	1 2	4	3	7		1030/1511	3.67	3.71	4.27	4.00	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	Τ	2	3	1	0	2.57	959/ 994	2.57	3.77	3.94	3.73	2.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	1	0	2	0	1		****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	254/ 278	3.29	3.15	4.19	3.97	3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	1	2	1		3.40	250/ 260		3.40	4.46	4.41	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	251/ 259	3.00	3.65	4.33	4.19	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15 15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U	U	U	2	U	U	3.00				4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH Baltimore County SURI, MANIL Fall 2005

Page 1110 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: WOODS, DELENA

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 43

Fall 2005

Page 1111 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	10	11	7	10	5	2.74	1651/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	2.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	10	7	18	3.77	1364/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	8	22	4.07	980/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	31	5	0	3	1	3	2.75	1592/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	2	6	9	13	4.10	702/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1066/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	8	10	22	4.19	945/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	1	2	5	23	10	3.95	1595/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	7	3	12	11	3	3.00	1540/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	6	11	6	12	3.41	1497/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2		12	18		1448/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	5	9	7			1296/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	4	7	2	7	8			1402/1575		4.23	4.27	4.17	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	27	2	2	3	2			1190/1380		3.51			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_		_	_	_	_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	9	4	5	1	5	2.54	1468/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	6	3	6	3	6	3.00	1420/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	5	9	2	5	3.04	1414/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	19	19	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 994	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
- 1														
Laboratory	2.2	0	0	0	^	1	0	4 00	++++/ 265	****	2 [2	4 00	2 07	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	9	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 265		3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	2		3	0	2		****/ 278	2.92 ****	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260		3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	2	0	3 00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.12	4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	۷	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 49			4.27	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: WOODS, DELENA

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1111 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	А	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

University of Maryland ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC Baltimore County

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 43

WOODS, DELENA Fall 2005

Page 1112 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eane	ncie	g		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
×														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	10	8	12	7	6	2.79	1647/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	2.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	9	9	17	3.79	1346/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	9	10	20	4.00	1016/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	5	0	4	3	6	3.28	1513/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	2	0	7	7	9	3.84	966/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	31	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1251/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	11	21	4.09	1037/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	1	30	10	4.14	1497/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	5	9	19	2	3.38	1431/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	4	10	8	17	3.70	1433/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	9	7	23	4.12	1451/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	10	5	20	3.83	1255/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	1	10	6	18	3.78	1279/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	26	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	1217/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	8	2	8	5	9	3.16	1318/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	6	4	10	9	3.50	1303/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	7	2	7	4	10	3.27	1368/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	13	22	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	****/ 994	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	4	1	3	0	4	2.92	265/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	2.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	10	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	0	5	0	1	2.75	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	0	5	0	2	3.25	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: WOODS, DELENA

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1112 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 106 0301 University of Maryland
Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: WOODS, DELENA

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1113

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	7	3	6	3	5	2.83	1646/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	3	5	11	3.79	1346/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	6	11	4.04	992/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1107/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	4	15	4.24	889/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	16	8	4.33	1361/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	2	8	9	1	3.04	1534/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	4	5	9	6	3.71	1430/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	5	2	15	4.21	1420/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	3	6	10	3.75	1302/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	1	6	5	6	3.26	1442/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	3.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1196/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	5	5	2	1	1	2.14	1501/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	0	3	3	4	3.21	1390/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	3	1	5	3	3.13	1398/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 994	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Title

Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA

Enrollment: 59 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1114 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	8	5	5	3.15	1605/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	338/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	250/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	825/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	14	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	926/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	445/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1412/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	4	11	2	3.68	1286/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.68
Lecture	_		_			_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42				4.43	4.37	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	6	17		1118/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	438/1582		4.13	4.26	4.17	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	0	1		4.65	509/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	489/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	0	1	3	8	3.53	1161/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	4	4	7		1171/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	3	4	7		1249/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	0	1	0	1	3		****/ 994		3.77	3.94	3.73	***
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	***
Combras														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.41	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	_	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 51			1.11	3.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	***	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1114 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 57
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1115 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncie	s			tructor	Course	_			
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	3	8	6	2	3.25	1583/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	6	6	3.80	1340/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	845/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1094/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	769/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	828/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	9	6	3.85	1258/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1412/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	1252/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1300/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	1283/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	1099/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	1115/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1149/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	1195/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1239/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1249/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 8 0.00-0.99 1 A 6		Red	 guir	ed f	 or M	ajor:	 s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 10						,				_	-			-

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				2	0						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 25

ELEMENT FUNC Baltimore County RAJAL Fall 2005

Page 1116 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain new	v insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	2	1	5	5	12	3.96	1246/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.96
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	9	3.96	1196/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.96
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	7	3	13	4.08	968/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.08
4. Did oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	16	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	892/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.22
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	9	3	1	3	4	5	3.44	1274/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.44
6. Did wr:	itten assi	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	17	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	1475/1535	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	2.88
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	3	5	1	16	4.20	934/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.20
8. How man	ny times w	vas class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	565/1673	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How wor	uld you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	11	2	3.62	1324/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.62
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lecture	s well	orepared	3	0	0	1	4	4	13	4.32	1094/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.32
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	n the subject	2	0	0	1	1	10	11	4.35	1348/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.35
3. Was led	Lecture material presented and explained clear the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	4	2	6	10	4.00	1129/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.00
4. Did the						0	1	2	3	8	8	3.91	1216/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	3.91
5. Did aud	diovisual	our understanding	2	16	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1298/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	2.71		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus		what you learned	10	0	3	2	3	4	3	3.13	1324/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.13	
				d to participate	10	0	2	1	1	5	6		1180/1515		3.76	4.24	3.97	3.80
		_	_	d open discussion	13	0	2	4	3	0	3		1457/1511		3.71	4.27	4.00	2.83
		chniques succe			10	13	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 994		3.77	3.94	3.73	****
		Labora	+0227															
2 Were w	ou provide		_	ground information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
				or lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260		3.40	4.46	4.41	****
	_	ructor provid			24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259		3.65	4.33	4.19	****
i. Dia cin	c rub riib	raccor provid	e abbib		2.	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	_	3.00	, 233		3.03	1.33	1.10	
		Self	Paced															
				what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did st	udy questi	ions make clea	r the ex	xpected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
_		cts with the i		_	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 50		4.33	4.44	4.39	****
		t/tutoring by	_	_	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35		****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were th	here enoug	gh proctors fo	r all th	ne students	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
				- 														
00-27 28-55	7 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	2 0	A 6 B 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 6		Cer	nera	1				1	Under-9	rad ?	25	Non-	major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 2		Gel	c.a.	-				_	onder -g	_uu 2		14011-	, O I	ر ہے
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E1	ecti	Ves				2	#### -	Means t	here :	are not	enoud	h
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.1						_	respons				_	
				I O		O+1	ner					5	I CBPOIIS		.c brai	cai		
				? 1		001						_						
				• =														

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 36

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1117

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		this course	1	0	2	0	12	8	13	3.86	1353/16	74	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.86
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	1	0	7	6	21	4.31			4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.31
		uestions reflec	_		1	0	2	0	3	6	24	4.43	672/14	23	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.43
		uations reflect			2	19	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	996/16	09	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.13
				hat you learned	1	17	3	0	6	4	5		1267/15		3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.44
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	23	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1207/15	35	3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.67
7. Was tl	he grading	g system clearl	y explai	ned	1	1	0	4	3	6	21	4.29	820/16	51	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.29
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	212/16	73	4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.97
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	9	0	2	0	5	11	9	3.93	1090/16	56	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.93
		Lectur	е																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	repared	2	0	1	0	0	7	26	4.68	648/15	86	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.68
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	1024/15	85	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.71
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	2	0	3	0	4	9	18	4.15	1043/15	82	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.15
4. Did tl	he lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	2	0	1	1	3	5	24	4.47	730/15	75	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.47
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	4	19	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	992/13	80	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.62
		Discus	sion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	hat you learned	21	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	948/15	20	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.87	
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	to participate	20	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	898/15	15	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did tl	he instru	ctor encourage	open discussion	21	0	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	1194/15	11	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.80	
4. Were	special to		22	12	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 9	94	4.75	3.77	3.94	3.73	****		
		Labora	tory																
1. Did tl	he lab ind	crease understa	nding of	the material	31	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 2	65	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequa	te backg	round information	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 2	78	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were	necessary	materials avai	lable fo	r lab activities	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 2	60	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did th	he lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 2	59	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	33	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 2	33	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
		Semina	r																
1. Were a	assigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 1	03	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was tl	he instru	ctor available	for indi	vidual attention	35	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 1	01	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
	_	-		hat you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0			95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
_		ons contribute		you learned	34	0	0	0	2	0	0			99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were	criteria :	for grading mad	e clear		34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
! -		Field											,						
2. Dia yo	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur evalu	ation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/	11	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	***
2 Wassa		Self acts with the i		m holmful	2 -	^	0	^	0	0	1	E 00	****/	50	****	4 22	1 11	4 20	****
J. were	YOUR COUR	ı neibini	35	0	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/	0		4.33	4.44	4.39			
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n												
Credits 1		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3				Гуре	е			Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	A 13		Red		ed f	or Ma	aior	 s 1	6	 Gradu	ate		0	Majo	 or	0	
28-55	1	B 10						. ,	_	-				-) ~		-		
56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Gei	nera	1				1	Under	-gra	ad 3	6	Non-	-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 1														3 -	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1		Ele	ecti	ves				4					re not	enoug	h	

I 0 Other 7 ? 1

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: STARK, BETSY

Enrollment:

Fall 2005 57 Questionnaires: 32

Page 1118 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	20	4.50	607/1674	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	27	4.77	248/1674	4.18	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	226/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	1	5	1	6		1348/1609	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	352/1585	3.91	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	2	2		4.33		3.81	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2			157/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8		4.74		4.48	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	331/1656	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.57
- ·														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4 00	266/1506	4 01	4 4 5	4 42	4 27	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	266/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1			0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	5.00 4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0 1	0	0	0	0	5 3	27 28	4.84	208/1582 171/1575	4.20 4.14	4.13	$4.26 \\ 4.27$	$4.17 \\ 4.17$	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	290/1380	3.52	4.23			4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	15	1	U	Т	4	13	4.53	290/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	546/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	620/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	3.97	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	4	18	4.38	769/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	20	1	3	0	0	2		****/ 994				3.73	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	3	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	***
Dield Manh														
Field Work	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	2 75	++++/ 76	****	2 10	2 00	2 20	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	-	1	0	-	1	2		****/ 76		3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	1	2		****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1 2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	2	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	****/ 49			4.27	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	1	1	3 33	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	2	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 31	****	****		3.88	****
1 onde onough proceeds for all one beaucifes			9	3	3	0	_	5.00	, 31				5.00	

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: STARK, BETSY

Enrollment: 57

Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1118 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	А	15	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: STARK, BETSY

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 29

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Р

I

?

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1119 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					_							_			_ ,	_
	Ouestions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Se Me
	General															
	n new insights, skills fr		0	0	1	2	6	7	13		1196/1674		4.07	4.27	4.07	4.
	structor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	352/1674		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.
	m questions reflect the		0	0	0	0	3	1	25	4.76			4.38	4.27	4.16	4.
	evaluations reflect the e	- 3	0	8	0	0	1			4.76	,		4.12	4.22	4.05	4.
	ed readings contribute to		0	6	0	2	1			4.30			3.88	3.96	3.88	4.
	assignments contribute	_	0	15	0	0	3	4		4.29	,		4.17	4.08	3.89	4.
	ding system clearly expl	ained	0	0 0	0	0	1	5 8			231/1651		4.42			4.
_	mes was class cancelled	-6	0 10	2	0	0	2				1001/1673 324/1656		4.74	4.69 4.07	4.67	4.
. How would y	ou grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	10	۷	U	U	2	3	12	4.59	324/1050	3.73	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.
	Lecture															
. Were the in	structor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	24	4.75	496/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.37	4
. Did the ins	structor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	26	4.82	762/1585	4.49	4.69	4.69	4.60	4
. Was lecture	material presented and	explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	299/1582	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.17	4
. Did the led	tures contribute to what	you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	225/1575	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.17	4
Did audiovi	sual techniques enhance	your understanding	3	15	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	666/1380	3.52	3.51	3.94	3.78	4
	Discussion															
Did class d	discussions contribute to	what you learned	7	0	2	2	1	1	16	4.23	673/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	4
	udents actively encourage		7	0	0	0	1			4.77					3.97	
	structor encourage fair a		7	0	2	1	0	2		4.41						
	il techniques successful	na open arroadrien	8	13	0	0	1	0	7		115/ 994					
	Laboratory				_				_							
	ovided with adequate bac		26	0	1	1	0	0	Ţ		****/ 278			4.19	3.97	*
. Did the lar	o instructor provide assi	stance	26	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	*
	Seminar															
. Were assign	ed topics relevant to th	e announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	*
	Field Work															
Did field e	experience contribute to	what vou learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	*
	early understand your eva		28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77		3.20	3.93	3.42	*
-	gree could you discuss yo		28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48		****		4.00	*
Did golf no	Self Paced aced system contribute to	what way laawaad	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	2 07	*
	questions make clear the		28	0	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 52		4.67		3.87 3.91	*
. Dia staay g	questions make treat the	expected goal	20	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 52		4.07	4.20	3.91	
		Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned	l Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
 00-27 7	0.00-0.99 0	A 14		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma			8	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	
28-55 2	1.00-1.99 0	В 3		100	2411	- Lu I	J_ 1.10	ـ ت	2	-	Gradat	~	•	114.50	-	
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 1	C 5		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad ?	29	Non-	major	
84-150 2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Gel	LLCIA	_				_	onder -g	1 uu 2		14011-		
04-100 2	3.00-3.49 2	ט ע														

Electives

9

Other

Title FINITE MATHEMATICS

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1120 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean		Mean	
General	•		_	_		_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	6	8	2	2		1663/1674		4.07	4.27	4.07	2.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	5	3		1594/1674		4.24	4.23	4.16	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	1	8	8		1256/1423	3.57	4.38	4.27	4.16	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	1	2	6	3		1452/1609		4.12	4.22	4.05	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	0	3	6	7		1066/1585	3.74	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	2	2	4	3	2		1430/1535		4.17	4.08	3.89	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	4	4	11		1228/1651		4.42	4.18	4.10	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	21		868/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	2	8	4	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	6	6	5	2	3.05	1535/1586	3.05	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	15		1166/1585		4.69	4.69	4.60	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	5	7	2	2		1550/1582	2.74	4.13	4.26	4.17	2.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	6	5	3		1480/1575	3.05	4.23	4.27	4.17	3.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	2	0	1	0	0		****/1380	****	3.51	3.94	3.78	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	2	8	1	2		1463/1520	2.61	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	4	2	5	4		1417/1515		3.76	4.24	3.97	3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	5	9	4		1103/1511	3.94	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	5	17	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	***	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	1	0	0	0	1	3 00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
J. Were effected for grading made effect	20	_	_	O	O	O	_	3.00	, ,,			1.11	3.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 49	***	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	0	0	1	2 67	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.67	4.09	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 31	***	****	4.34	3.88	****
J. were there enough proctors for all the students	∠∪	۷	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 31			4.34	3.00	

Course-Section: MATH 115 0201 Title

FINITE MATHEMATICS

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1120 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I

Title Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 24 Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1121 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

					Fre	-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills from	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	558/1674	4.54	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.54
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	161/1674	4.88	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.88
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	66/1423	4.96	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.96
4. Did other evaluat	cions reflect the ex	xpected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.67
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	7	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	692/1585	4.12	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.12
6. Did written assig	nments contribute	to what you learned	0	10	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	558/1535	4.36	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.36
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	104/1651	4.91	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.91
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	778/1673	4.87	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.87
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	345/1656	4.55	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.55
	T															
1. Were the instruct	Lecture		2	0	0	0	0	_	17	4.77	453/1586	4.77	4 4 5	4.43	4.37	4.77
2. Did the instruct			2	0	0	0	0	0	17 22	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.45 4.69	4.43	4.37	5.00
3. Was lecture mater		•	2	0	1	0	1	6	14	4.45	704/1582	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.17	4.45
4. Did the lectures	-	-	1	0	1	0	0	3	19	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.13	4.27	4.17	4.70
5. Did audiovisual t		-	1	19	1	0	0	0	3		****/1380	****	3.51	3.94	3.78	****
J. Did addiovisual d	eciniiques emiance	your understanding	_	10	_	U	U	U	J	1.00	/1300		3.31	J. J.	3.70	
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1520	4.86	3.52	4.01	3.76	4.86
2. Were all students	actively encourage	ed to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	568/1515	4.57	3.76	4.24	3.97	4.57
Did the instructor	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1511	4.71	3.71	4.27	4.00	4.71
 Were special tech 	nniques successful		17	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	178/ 994	4.57	3.77	3.94	3.73	4.57
	- 1															
0	Laboratory		23	0	0	0	^	1	0	4 00	****/ 278	****	2 15	4 10	2 07	****
1 1	ere you provided with adequate background informat						0	U T	1	1.00	****/ 278 ****/ 259		3.15	4.19	3.97	****
4. Did the lab instr	the lab instructor provide assistance						U	U	Т	5.00	****/ 259		3.05	4.33	4.19	
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
		-														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	16	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	0						

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 160
Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1122 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

86	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
86	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	15	27	37		1123/1674	3.87	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	13	22	46	4.28	894/1674	3.91	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	10	19	55	4.51		3.95	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	32	1	5	12	12	23		1146/1609	3.63	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	30	0	6	11	23	14	3.83	976/1585	3.57	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	48	2	2	8	13	10		1132/1535	3.60	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	4	19	57	4.57	445/1651	4.30	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	80	4.98	212/1673	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	1	2	11	27	24	4.09	900/1656	3.69	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.09
Taskuus														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	6	16	ΕO	4.55	816/1586	4.29	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	9	59 70	4.78	853/1585	4.29	4.45	4.43	4.57	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	14	22	44	4.76	935/1582	3.81	4.13	4.26		4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	6	23	52	4.45	755/1575	3.96	4.13	4.27	4.17	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	38	6	3	4	10	21	3.84		3.59	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.84
J. Did additivisual techniques emhance your understanding	-	50	U	J	-	10	21	3.01	030/1300	3.35	3.31	3.71	3.70	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	14	3	18	22	23	3.46	1189/1520	3.47	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	7	11	15	14	33		1246/1515	3.55	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	7	5	17	22	27	3.73	1232/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	8	59	2	2	8	5	2	3.16	****/ 994	3.27	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	16	3	3	4	4	2		****/ 265	3.67	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	1	2	4	5	10	3.95	198/ 278	3.77	3.15	4.19	3.97	3.95
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	10	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	5	1	2	1	6	4		****/ 259	4.29	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	11	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	9	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	8	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 101	****	****	4.41	4.18	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	71	8	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	71	4	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	71	5	0	1	2	3	4		****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
5. Note differia for grading made ofear		5	Ü	_	_	3	-	1.00	, ,,				3.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	73	0	3	1	1	5	3	3.31	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	74	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	74	2	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	74	4	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	73	6	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	1	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	2	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	2	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	,	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	71	2	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 160
Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1122 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	6	 А	26	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	29						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	86	Non-major	86
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	0						

PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Title Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 121 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1123 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	es 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	10	27	22	4.20	1017/1674	3.87	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	23	29	4.37	776/1674	3.91	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	17	36	4.51	575/1423	3.95	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	38	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1254/1609	3.63	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	3	3	9	17	10	3.67	1121/1585	3.57	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	36	3	1	6	6	6	3.50	1295/1535	3.60	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	17	38	4.58	432/1651	4.30	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	52			1541/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	6	22	23	4.33	615/1656	3.69	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	15	40	4.67	663/1586	4.29	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	17	38		1106/1585	4.50	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	19	34	4.53	610/1582		4.13	4.26	4.17	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	40	4.61	565/1575	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	38	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	666/1380	3.59	3.51	3.94	3.78	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	5	12	9	16		1200/1520		3.52	4.01	3.76	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	4	16	15	10		1318/1515	3.55	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	3	12	13	16		1270/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	11	38	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	****/ 994	3.27	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	10	1	3	4	3	7	3.67	222/ 265	3.67	3.52	4.23	3.97	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	4	0	5	8	7	3.58	234/ 278	3.77	3.15	4.19	3.97	3.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	9	0	0	5	3	4		****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	4	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	150/ 259	4.29	3.65	4.33	4.19	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	10	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	4	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	7	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	5	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	6	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	1	2	1	4		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	3	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 121
Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1123 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	24	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	9	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 150 0301 Title

PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: WILSON, MARY C

Enrollment: 156 Questionnaires: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1124 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	7	8	17	16	12	3 30	1572/1674	3 87	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	12	7	16	15	10		1602/1674	3.91	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	٥	1	16	8	13	13	9		1393/1423	3.95	4.38	4.27	4.16	2.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	٥	20	4	7	13	14	2		1552/1609	3.63	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	٥	23	7	2	12	8	8		1380/1585		3.88	3.96	3.88	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	٥	31	1	6	7	7	0		1289/1535		4.17	4.08	3.89	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	٥	2	3	7	11	17	20		1324/1651	4.30	4.42	4.18	4.10	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	11	8	51		778/1673		4.74	4.10	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	10	9	17	7	3		1611/1656		4.74	4.09		2.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	Τ	10	9	1/	/	3	2.05	1011/1020	3.69	4.00	4.07	3.90	2.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	5	16	14	20	3.65	1445/1586	4.29	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	11	15	29		1455/1585		4.69	4.69	4.60	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	15	14	12	10	7		1558/1582		4.13	4.26	4.17	2.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	16	11	13	8	12		1526/1575		4.23	4.27	4.17	2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	Ω	9	Δ2	4	9		1259/1380		3.51	3.94		2.92
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	_	21	O	,	O	-	,	2.92	1239/1300	3.33	3.31	3.94	3.70	2.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	4	17	11	18	3.51	1169/1520	3.47	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.51
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	7	4	17	11	17	3.48	1310/1515	3.55	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	8	17	3.39	1335/1511	3.59	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	4	23	6	3	8	8	8	3.27	830/ 994	3.27	3.77	3.94	3.73	3.27
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	3.67	3.52	4.23	3.97	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	3	А	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	6						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37	=			
				2	Δ						

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Title Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment:

65 Questionnaires: 40 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1125 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	16	12	3.95	1259/1674	3.85	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	18	18	4.35	803/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	27			4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	3	7	5	8	3.78	1299/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	3	7	6	5		1156/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	3	4	9	6		1302/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	10	28	4.63	372/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	0	37	4.92		4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	18	16	4.28	680/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.28
Lecture	1	0	0	0	2	1.0	20	4 50	774/1506	4 40	4 4 5	4 42	4 27	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1 2	0	0	0	3 0	10 15		4.59	774/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.59
 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 	1	0	0	0	4	15	23 26	4.51	1142/1585 567/1582	4.57 3.98	4.69 4.13	4.69 4.26	4.60 4.17	4.61 4.56
	0	0	0	1	4	8	26 27	4.50	669/1575	4.06		4.26	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	30	1	1	2	1	2 / 5	3.80	866/1380	3.53	4.23 3.51			3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	30	1	1	2	Т	5	3.80	866/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	11	4	12	5	4	2.64	1459/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	3	14	8	6		1395/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	6	11	6	9		1348/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.34
4. Were special techniques successful	4	30	1	1	1	2	1				3.77		3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	10	0	3	2	1	0	2.67	****/ 265	3.44	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	5	0	3	1	2	2.55	275/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	2.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	9	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar	2.0	_	0	0	•	-	-	4 50		de de de de	ale ale ale ale	4 41	4 22	als als als als
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	6	0	0	0	1	Ţ		,	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	6	0	0	0	1	0			****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33 33	5 5	1 0	0 1	0	1 1	0		****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	****	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	U	1	U	Т	U	3.00	***/ 9/			4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	3	0	0	2	2	3 00	****/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	0	1	2			3.20	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	3	1	0	0	1	1		•	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	3	2	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	4	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
1. 11. Sometimes mary you early out rich desivities	J 1	-	J	J	J	_	_	1.50	, 10				1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 61	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	1	0	0	1	1	3			4.67	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1125 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	4	A	22	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1126 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_	_		_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	12	19	4.50	607/1674		4.07	4.27	4.07	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	26	4.72	314/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	310/1423	4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	715/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	1	5	3	12	3.83	976/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	310/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	20	4.56	445/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	887/1673	4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	200/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.73
T a shows														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4 0 4	210/1506	4 40	4 4 5	1 12	4 27	1 0 1
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	28	4.84	319/1586		4.45	4.43	4.37	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	567/1585	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	313/1582	3.98	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	203/1575	4.06	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	Τ	Τ	Τ	0	6	4.00	666/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	10	15	4.13	751/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	6	2	17	3.97	1069/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	6	6	14		1085/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	2	20	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	662/ 994			3.94		3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 265		3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1127 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	10	15	4.24	966/1674	3.85	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	483/1674		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	563/1423	4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	892/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	2	4	2	8	3.82	986/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	528/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	186/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	4	4.14	1504/1673	4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	12	12	4.44	465/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	648/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	1002/1585	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	18	4.50	632/1582	3.98	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	423/1575	4.06	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	3	2	2	3	3.27	1152/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	1	10	4	4	3.04	1345/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	2	6	5	7	3.19	1395/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	1	10	3	7	3.23	1375/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	4	20	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 994	3.70	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	5	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	3.44	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 259	***	3.65	4.33	4.19	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	3.20	3.20	3.93	3.42	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.87	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.67	4.67	4.26	3.91	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
Freq	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Do	ason	a			Ту	n 0			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: MANUKYAN, ZORAY

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1128 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	5	7	3.62	1474/1674	3.85	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	5	5	3.52	1489/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	3	9	3.71	1188/1423	4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	941/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1199/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	667/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1070/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	7	4	1	3.00	1540/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	4	4	9	3.86	1385/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	2	15		1292/1585		4.69	4.69	4.60	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	6	6	3	3.19	1481/1582	3.98	4.13	4.26	4.17	3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	3	7	6	3.62	1346/1575	4.06	4.23	4.27	4.17	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	Δ	5	5	3 65	1104/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	8	3	5		1260/1515		3.76	4.24	3.97	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	5	5	3		1361/1511		3.71	4.27	4.00	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	4	16	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 994			3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory		_					_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18 19	2 0	0	0	0	U	1		****/ 265		3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information			1	0	0	0	1		****/ 278		3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260		3.40	4.46	4.41	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	5						

0501 University of Maryland

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I Baltimore County

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
Instructor: SONG, YOON J (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 55

Questionnaires: 36

Fall 2005

Page 1129 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	•		_	_	_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	3	13	16		1155/1674		4.07	4.27	4.07	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	19	14	4.31	870/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	24	4.58	482/1423		4.38	4.27	4.16	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	2 1	8		4.45	567/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15 20	2 1	3 0	2	6 2	9	4.38	1006/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96 4.08	3.88	3.81 4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	20	0	0	1	4			538/1535 157/1651	4.10 4.46	$4.17 \\ 4.42$	4.08	4.10	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	25	10		1420/1673	4.46	4.42	4.16	4.10	4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	20	10		770/1656			4.07		4.23
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	U	U	U	J	20	10	7.21	770/1030	3.07	1.00	1.07	3.90	1.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	284/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	981/1585	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	11	22	4.50	632/1582	3.98	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	7	26	4.56	635/1575	4.06	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	27	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	962/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.67
Discussion	_		_		_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	./	15		1010/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	7	6	8	11		1310/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1 1	0 30	4	3 1	11 0	5	12 3		1306/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.51 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	1	30	1	Т	U	0	3	3.60	****/ 994	3.70	3.//	3.94	3.73	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	10	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	240/ 265	3.44	3.52	4.23	3.97	3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	4	2	4	4	4	3.11	256/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	3.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	15	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	12	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	14	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	***	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	58/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	3.10
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	58/ 77	3.20	3.20	3.93	3.42	3.20
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	3	0	0	0	2	5		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
The same of the sa		•	-	Ü	Ū	_	-	,	, 10					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	27/ 61	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.87	4.09
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	23/ 52	4.67	4.67	4.26	3.91	4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	32/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.39	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	***

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Title Instructor: SONG, YOON J (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 55

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1129 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	А	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SONG, YOON J (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1130 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	3	13	16	4.06	1155/1674	3.85	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	19	14	4.31	870/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	24	4.58	482/1423	4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	567/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	3	1	6	9	3.81	1006/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	538/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	157/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	25	10	4.25	1420/1673	4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	615/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1585		4.69	4.69	4.60	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71			4.13	4.26	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	6		****/1575		4.23	4.27	4.17	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/1380		3.51		3.78	3.67
Discussion	_	_			_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	7	15		1010/1520		3.52	4.01	3.76	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	7	6	8	11		1310/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	3	11	5	12		1306/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	1	30	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 994	3.70	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	10	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	240/ 265	3.44	3.52	4.23	3.97	3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	4	2	4	4	4	3.11	256/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	3.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	15	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	12	0	0	1	2	2		****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	14	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	,	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	58/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	3.10
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	58/ 77	3.20	3.20	3.93	3.42	3.20
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	27/ 61	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.87	4.09
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	23/ 52		4.67	4.26	3.91	4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	32/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.39	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20		****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 36

Title

SONG, YOON J (Instr. B)

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA			Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

Page 1130

JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Title Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 76 Questionnaires: 39

Fall 2005

Page 1131 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	7	11	5	15	3.67	1449/1674	3.85	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	12	17		1035/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	14	21	4.38	718/1423	4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	2	0	4	10	11	4.04	1074/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	956/1585	3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	643/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	30	4.66	340/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	724/1673	4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	10	17	3	3.77	1230/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	28	4.64	693/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	1002/1585	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	8	14	15		1094/1582	3.98	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	- 8	19		1070/1575	4.06	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	0	0	7	3	3	3.69					3.78	3.69
or pro ductor booming dob commission four analysisment	_		Ü	ŭ	•	J	3	3.03	711, 1300	3.33	3.31	3.71	3.70	3.05
Discussion				_		_			440/4500				0 76	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	12	6	12		1149/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	2	9	7	13		1256/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	0	12	-			1257/1511			4.27	4.00	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	4	29	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 994	3.70	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	3.44	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
1. Did the lab instituted provide assistance	57	_	O	Ü	O	O	_	3.00	/ 237		3.03	1.55	1.10	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	3.20	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
									,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61		4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	4.67	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment:

76

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1131 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	 А	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Title CALC & ANALY
Instructor: SURI, MANIL

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2005

Page 1132 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

					Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did von	ı gəin ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	5	5	3	3 64	1459/1674	3 85	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.64
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	6	3		1352/1674		4.24	4.23	4.16	3.79
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	3	3	4	4		1226/1423			4.27	4.16	3.64
	_	ations reflect			0	4	0	1	4	4	1		1452/1609		4.12	4.22	4.05	3.50
				what you learned	0	6	1	4	0	1	2		1495/1585			3.96	3.88	2.88
				o what you learned	0	9	0	0	4	1	0		1406/1535		4.17	4.08	3.89	3.20
		system clearly		-	0	0	2	0	2	2	8		1097/1651		4.42	4.18	4.10	4.00
		was class canc		illied	0	0	0	0	0	5	-		1097/1031		4.74	4.69		4.64
	-			hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	5	_		1237/1656		4.00	4.07		3.75
9. 110W WOL	iia you g.	rade the overa	II ceac	ming effectiveness			U	U	5	J	۷	3.75	1237/1030	3.07	1.00	1.07	3.70	3.75
1		Lecture			0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4 00	1100/1506	4 40	4 45	4 42	4 27	4 00
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	3	4	7		1120/1586			4.43	4.37	4.29
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	2 3	4 5	8		1292/1585		4.69	4.69	4.60	4.43
		ture material presented and explained cleater lectures contribute to what you learned to iovisual techniques enhance your understar				0	0	3	-	-			1381/1582		4.13	4.26	4.17	3.57
			-	0	0	1	5	3	3			1487/1575		4.23	4.27	4.17	3.00	
5. Did auc	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	12	0	0	0	1	Τ	4.50	****/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	****
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	what you learned	0	0	4	3	4	2	1	2.50	1470/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.50		
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	ively encouraged to participat				2	2	7	0	3	3.00	1420/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	4	2	2	4	2	2.86	1454/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	2.86
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		0	11	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.70	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
		- 1																
1 Did +ba	a lah ing	Labora	_	of the material	11	2	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 265	3.44	2 52	4.23	3.97	****
				ground information	11	0	1	0	0	2	0		****/ 278			4.19	3.97	****
Z. Were yo	ou provid	eu with adequa	Le Dack	ground informacion	11	U	_	U	U	2	U	3.00	276	2.92	3.13	4.13	3.91	
		Field !	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you	ı clearly	understand you	ur eval	uation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	3.20	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
		Self 1	Daced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced			what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
	_	ions make clea:		_	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52		4.67	4.26	3.91	****
		k/tutoring by p			13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35			4.36	3.92	****
				Frequ	.encv	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 8														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0													-		
Grad.	0 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					El€	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0		Oth	ıer				1	.3							
	I 0																	

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Title CALC & ANALY G
Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 70
Questionnaires: 14

70

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 1133 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	6	3	1	2 02	1640/1674	3.85	4.07	4.27	4.07	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	3	0		1628/1674	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.07	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	4	1		1349/1423	4.21	4.38	4.27	4.16	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	5	1		1377/1609	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	2	4	3.82		3.67	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	870/1535	4.10	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	5	4		1317/1651	4.46	4.42	4.18	4.10	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.66	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	5	0	0	2.33	1631/1656	3.87	4.00	4.07	3.96	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1448/1586	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.37	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	4	6		1460/1585	4.57	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	6	3	0		1554/1582		4.13	4.26	4.17	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	3	5	0		1476/1575	4.06	4.23	4.27	4.17	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1290/1380	3.53	3.51	3.94	3.78	2.75
Discussion				_									0 = 6	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	4	1		1221/1520	3.38	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	3	4	0	2		1445/1515	3.39	3.76	4.24	3.97	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	4	3	2		1291/1511	3.44	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.70	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 265	3.44	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 278	2.92	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	* * * *	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar	10	•	0	0	-	•	0	2 00	***** / 100	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 47	4 22	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101 ****/ 95	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13 13	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.31 4.39	3.99 4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
ni al di Marela														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	3.10	3.10	3.98	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	3.∠U ****	3.∠U ****	3.93 4.45	3.42 4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	4.09	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.67	4.67	4.09	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	***	****	4.34	3.88	****
	-	-	-	-		-	-		,			· - -		

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 70
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1133 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other					
				?	0						

Title CALC/ANALY GEOM I-HONO

Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 7

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

2

F

Ρ

I

1

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1134 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eane.	ncies	3		Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General															
_	_	ew insights,skills fr		0	0	0	1	0	5	1		1353/1674			4.27	4.07	3.86
		ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	495/1674		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.57
	_	uestions reflect the		0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43			4.38	4.27	4.16	4.43
		uations reflect the ϵ		0	1	0	0	0	5	_	4.17	,		4.12	4.22	4.05	4.17
	_	eadings contribute to	_	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.14			3.88	3.96	3.88	4.14
		signments contribute		0	0	0	0	1	3	3		631/1535		4.17	4.08	3.89	4.29
		g system clearly expl	.ained	0	0	0	0	2	1		4.29			4.42	4.18	4.10	4.29
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1200/1656	3.80	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.80
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	974/1586	4.43	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.43
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.86
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1582	4.14	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.14
		es contribute to what		0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	612/1575	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.57
		l techniques enhance	=	0	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.00
		Discussion															
1 Did ala	acc dica	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.52	4.01	3.76	4.00	
		_	2	0	0	0	1	3	1		1024/1515		3.76	4.24	3.70	4.00	
	re all students actively encouraged to participa d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				0	0	0	3	2	0		1333/1511			4.27		3.40
		ma open discussion	2	3	1	0	1	0								2.00	
4. Were S	Were special techniques successful					_	U	_	U	U	2.00	311/ 33-	2.00	3.77	3.94	3.73	2.00
		Laboratory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequate bac	kground information	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
		Seminar															
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available for in	dividual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did res	search pi	rojects contribute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
		Field Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
	_	y understand your eva	_	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
_		ctor available for co		6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
		could you discuss yo		6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
		s help you carry out		6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	***
		Self Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute to	what vou learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	***
				6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52		4.67	4.26	3.91	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful				0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50		4.33	4.44	4.39	****
		Frequ	iena:	, Die	trib	utio	n										
				. C.11 C Y	יסדט	CLID	uc10.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	ре 			Majors	3
00-27	1	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	1	Graduat	:e	0	Majo	or	1	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-9	grad	7	Non-	major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														
		2 50 4 00 0															

Electives

Other

0

6

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

? 0

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1135 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	2	5	11	3.79	1389/1674	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.07	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	14	4.29	882/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	11	9	4.13	943/1423	4.58	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	4	5	6	3.88	1236/1609	4.30	4.12	4.22	4.05	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	4	2	3	4	3.54	1205/1585	3.95	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	870/1535	4.52	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6		4.33	768/1651	4.60	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	,		4.74	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1146/1656	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	763/1586	4.81	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	13		1191/1585	4.79	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	7	11		1016/1582	4.60	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	730/1575		4.23	4.27	4.17	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	998/1380	3.75	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	8	2	4	3	2	2.42	1478/1520	3.22	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	5	4	3	5	3.21	1390/1515	3.40	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	5	8	1	3	2.89	1448/1511	3.30	3.71	4.27	4.00	2.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 278	2.71	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	***	****	4.48	4.18	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 49	***	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	 8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 18 ? 1

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1136 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	_		_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	28	4.68	393/1674	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	28	4.65	392/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	29	4.69	335/1423	4.58	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	583/1609	4.30	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	4	11	10	4.15	652/1585	3.95	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	301/1535	4.52	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	9	29	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	33	4.85	814/1673	4.74		4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	26	4.65	274/1656	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	31	4.78	453/1586	4.81	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	453/1585	4.79	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	14	26	4.65	452/1582	4.60	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	32	4.78	327/1575	4.66	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	28	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	406/1380	3.75			3.78	4.36
5. Fix additivibual ecominques emanes four andersounding	_		Ū	Ū	_			1.50	100, 1000	3.75	3.31	3.71	3.70	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	7	7	14	3.69	1080/1520	3.22	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	3	13	7	10	3.65	1260/1515	3.40	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	5	15	11	4.09	1021/1511	3.30	3.71	4.27	4.00	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	6	26	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/ 994	3.78	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 265	****	3 52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 278					****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 2/0	2.71	3.13	4.19	3.71	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
Freq	ienci	, Dia	tri h	utio	'n									
rieq	uency	, אדט	CLIDI	uLIO	111									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Тур	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	40	Non-major	35
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0301 University of Maryland

METRY Baltimore County (Instr. A) Fall 2005

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1137 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1 Did vor	ı dəin ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	546/1	1674	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.56
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	566/1		4.57	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.52
		estions reflec	_	_	0	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	470/1		4.58	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.59
		ations reflect			0	7	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	930/1		4.30	4.12	4.22		4.20
			_	what you learned	0	4	2	2	4	4		3.87			3.95	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.87
	_	-		what you learned o what you learned		13	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	116/1		4.52	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.85
		signments contr s system clearly		_	1	0	0	0	1	4		4.77			4.60	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.77
		was class canc		IIIeu	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81			4.74	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.81
				hing effectiveness		0	0	0	1	-		4.63					4.07		4.67
9. HOW WOL	iiu you g	rade the overa	II teati	.iiiig effectiveness	0	U	U	U	_	5	13	4.03	203/-	1030	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.90	4.07
		Lecture																	
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	538/1	1586	4.81	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.80
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	811/1	1585	4.79	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.84
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	690/1	1582	4.60	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.67
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what '	you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	19	4.50	692/1	1575	4.66	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.63
			contribute to what you learned echniques enhance your understanding		1	17	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	810/1		3.75	3.51			
		1000000	Discussion				_	_	_	_	_								
					_	_			_	_	_								
				what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	7	9		1068/1			3.52		3.76	3.71
		_	_	d to participate	3	0	2	4	3	4	11		1209/1		3.40	3.76	4.24		3.75
				d open discussion	3	0	4	3	7	3	7		1371/1		3.30	3.71	4.27		3.25
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		3	15	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	628/	994	3.78	3.77	3.94	3.73	3.78
		Labora	torv																
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	-	f the material	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
			_	ground information		0	1	0	1	1	0		****/		2.71	3.15	4.19	3.97	****
_	_	structor provid	-	_	24	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/		****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
		_		early specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****	****	4.20	4.19	****
5. were re	equiremen	.ts for tab rep	orts cie	early specified	24	2	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	***/	233	****		4.20	4.00	
		Field	Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
				Freç	uency	Dist	trib	ution	ı										
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5 				Тур	pe 			Majors 	3
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Grad	duate	=	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	в 7															
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 6		Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	er-gr	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1										_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 2		Ele	ectiv	ves				2	####	# - N	Means t	here a	are not	t enoug	ah
				P 0											es to k			_	
				I O		O+1	her				2	:4	7 001	- 01100	L	2 2191	Cai		
				? 3		001	1101				_								

Course-Section: MATH 152 0301 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 27

50

Page 1138
JAN 21, 2006

Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	546/1674	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.56
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear th	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	566/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.52
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect t	he expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	470/1423	4.58	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.59
		uations reflect th		0	7	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	930/1609	4.30	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.20
	_	5	to what you learned	0	4	2	2	4	4	11	3.87	946/1585	3.95	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.87
		_	te to what you learne		13	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	116/1535		4.17	4.08	3.89	4.85
	-	g system clearly e	-	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	220/1651		4.42	4.18	4.10	4.77
		was class cancell		0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81			4.74	4.69	4.67	4.81
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall	teaching effectivenes	s 20	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	214/1656	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.67
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	19	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.81	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.80
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem interest	ed in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.79	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.84
			nd explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.60	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.67
		es contribute to w		19	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	359/1575	4.66	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.63
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enhan	ce your understanding	19	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.75	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.89
		Discussio	n														
1. Did cl	lass discu		to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	7	9	3.71	1068/1520	3.22	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.71
			raged to participate	3	0	2	4	3	4	11	3.75	1209/1515	3.40	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.75
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage fai	r and open discussion	3	0	4	3	7	3	7	3.25	1371/1511	3.30	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.25
4. Were s	special te	echniques successf	ul	3	15	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	628/ 994	3.78	3.77	3.94	3.73	3.78
		Laborator	v														
1. Did th	ne lab ind		ng of the material	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
			background information		0	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 278		3.15	4.19	3.97	****
		structor provide a		24	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were r	requiremer	nts for lab report	s clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****
		Field Wor	k														
1. Did fi	ield exper		to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
			Fre	quenc	v Dis	trib	utio	n									
					, 515	0112	4010										
Credits E	Earned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grade	s 			Re	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; :=====
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 8		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1															
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5			Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2			El	ecti	ves				2	#### -				_	ſh
			P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
			I O		Ot	her				2	14						
			? 3	Other													

CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Title

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 57 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1139 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	20	4.56	546/1674	4 44	4 07	4.27	4.07	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	248/1674		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	167/1423	4.58	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	222/1609	4.30	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	0	3	2	8	3.93	865/1585	3.95	3.88	3.96	3.88	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	346/1535	4.52	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	1	21	4.56	445/1651	4.60	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	1203/1673	4.74	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	1	10	11	4.21	783/1656			4.07	3.96	4.21
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	86/1586	4.81	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	615/1585	4.79	4.45	4.43	4.60	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	496/1582	4.79	4.09	4.09	4.17	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	23	4.63					4.17	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			1	2	2	0	∠3 3		495/1575	4.66	4.23	4.27		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	Τ	2	2	U	3	3.25	1160/1380	3.75	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	3	3	3	10	3.32	1257/1520	3.22	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	4	7	2	10	3.56	1285/1515	3.40	3.76	4.24	3.97	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	2	3	2	13	3.75	1221/1511	3.30	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	22	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994	3.78	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
T albania banna														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1.0	7	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
	19	0	4	0	0	-	_		,					
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	U	4	U	U	0	3	2./1	269/ 278	2.71	3.15	4.19	3.97	2./1
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	0	1	2 33	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	2	0	0	0	0	7		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	3	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 48	****		4.12	4.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
_														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 1	.2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	=	0	Electives	2	#### - Means responses to		are not enougl gnificant	h

I 0 Other 22

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1140 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	607/1674	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	352/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	459/1423	4.58	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	786/1609	4.30	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	512/1585	3.95	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	608/1535	4.52	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	17	4.55	471/1651	4.60	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	1072/1673	4.74	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	437/1656	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	107/1586	4.81	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	17		1002/1585	4.79	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	246/1582	4.60	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	279/1575	4.66	4.23	4.27	4.17	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	2	4	5		974/1380		3.51	3.94	3.78	3.64
J. Did dudiovisual recimiques cimanee your understanding	_	,	2	_	2	•	,	3.01	J/1/1300	3.75	3.31	3.71	3.70	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	2	2	2	4	2.47	1473/1520	3.22	3.52	4.01	3.76	2.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	3	6	1	3	2.50	1470/1515	3.40	3.76	4.24	3.97	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	9	1	4	2	4	2.55	1474/1511	3.30	3.71	4.27	4.00	2.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	18	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	3.78	3.77	3.94	3.73	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	4	1	0	0	0	1	2 00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	2	0	1	0	1		****/ 278			4.19	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	U	4	U	_	U		2.50	276	2./1	3.13	4.19	3.91	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****		4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	2	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.12	4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	۷	1	U	Τ.	U	U	2.00	/ 49			4.2/	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1140 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0101 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS Baltimore County Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1141

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	140	
Questionnaires:	24	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	903/1674	4.26	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	578/1674	4.40	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.50
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	636/1423	4.38	4.38	4.27	4.16	4.46
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	11	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	552/1609	4.28	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.46
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	378/1585	4.29	3.88	3.96	3.88	4.44
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	8	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	737/1535	4.24	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	288/1651	4.65	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.71
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	2	19	3	4.04	1549/1673	4.44	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.04
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	794/1656	4.17	4.00	4.07	3.96	4.20
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	orepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	603/1586	4.56	4.45	4.43	4.37	4.71		
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	0	4	19		1024/1585	4.77	4.69	4.69	4.60	4.71
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	2	0	8	14	4.42	762/1582	4.38	4.13	4.26	4.17	4.42
		es contribute t			0	0	1	0	0	7	16	4.54		4.60		4.27	4.17	4.54
				our understanding	0	14	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	938/1380	3.70	3.51	3.94	3.78	3.70
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cla	agg diga			what you learned	9	0	2	0	4	3	6	3 73	1043/1520	3.87	3.52	4.01	3.76	3.73
				d to participate	10	0	1	1	2	1	-		971/1515	3.90	3.76	4.24	3.97	
				d open discussion	10	0	1	0	4	4	-		1166/1511	3.60	3.71	4.27	4.00	3.86
		echniques succe			10	8	0	0	3	1	2		600/ 994			3.94	3.73	3.83
				Frequ	onar	. Dia	- ri b	1+101	n									
				riequ	lency	DIS	CIID	uc10	11									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В 11			-			-						3 -		
56-83	6	C 10		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	24		
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.9						

1

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201 University of Maryland ELEMENTARY CALCULUS Baltimore County

Page 1142 Title JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: Arlinghaus, Fra Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 161 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies	5			tructor		Dept			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	979/1674	4.26	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.23
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	870/1674		4.24	4.23	4.16	4.31
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	803/1423		4.38	4.27	4.16	4.31
		uations reflect			0	3	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1029/1609	4.28	4.12	4.22	4.05	4.10
				what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	662/1585		3.88	3.96	3.88	4.14
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	643/1535	4.24	4.17	4.08	3.89	4.27
		g system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	419/1651	4.65	4.42	4.18	4.10	4.58
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	814/1673	4.44	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.85
	-			hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	1		849/1656			4.07	3.96	4.14
		Lectur																
1. Were t			1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	989/1586		4.45	4.43	4.37	4.42		
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11		737/1585		4.69	4.69	4.60	4.83		
		-		xplained clearly	1		0	1	1	3	7	4.33	,		4.13	4.26	4.17	4.33
		es contribute t		•	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	,		4.23	4.27	4.17	4.67
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	3.70	3.51	3.94	3.78	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	810/1520	3.87	3.52	4.01	3.76	4.00
				d to participate	7	0	1	0	1	2	2		1253/1515		3.76	4.24	3.97	3.67
				d open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	2	1		1351/1511		3.71	4.27	4.00	3.33
		echniques succe		a open arboabbion	7	-	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 994			3.94	3.73	****
	_	1																
				Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 2								-		-	-) •		-
56-83	0	C 4		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	13		
84-150	1	D 0									5				3			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	_j h	
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot:	her				1	.0	-		5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: Math 155 0301 (1914)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County

Title Elementary Calculus Instructor: Seidman, Thomas

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 23

Fall 2005

Page 3
JAN 21, 2006
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	5	6	6	4	3.22	1592/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	6	7	3.61	1451/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	6	5	3.45	1284/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1557/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	7	3	6	3.45	1260/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1398/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	1097/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	9	6	2	3.42	1412/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1476/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	981/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	5	7	2	4		1517/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	2.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	8	4	6	2		1517/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	3	1	1	0	1		1353/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	2.17
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1423/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1352/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1420/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 215 0101 University of Maryland JAN 21, 2006 Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S Baltimore County

Instructor: WANG, DAN 59

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 10

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 1143

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 1385/1674 3.80 4.07 4.27 4.32 3.80 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 3 3 4.00 1146/1674 4.00 4.24 4.23 4.26 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 803/1423 4.30 4.38 4.27 4.36 4.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1377/1609 3.67 4.12 4.22 4.23 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 2 1 1 2 3.50 1223/1585 3.50 3.88 3.96 3.91 3.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 3 1 2 $3.83\ 1083/1535\ 3.83\ 4.17\ 4.08\ 4.03\ 3.83$ 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 1 2 5 4.00 1097/1651 4.00 4.42 4.18 4.20 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.74 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 1 2 1 1 3.00 1540/1656 3.00 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 1004/1586 4.40 4.45 4.43 4.48 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 3 2 5 4.20 1423/1585 4.20 4.69 4.69 4.76 4.20 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 1 3 3 3.60 1371/1582 3.60 4.13 4.26 4.35 3.60 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 2 3 3 3.50 1367/1575 3.50 4.23 4.27 4.39 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 1 0 1 1 0 2.67 1304/1380 2.67 3.51 3.94 4.03 2.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 3 0 2 3.50 1169/1520 3.50 3.52 4.01 4.03 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 2 1 2 3.67 1253/1515 3.67 3.76 4.24 4.28 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 976/1511 4.17 3.71 4.27 4.28 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 4 5 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-		_	
				?	0						

INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Title Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1144 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne		s from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	817/1674	4.09	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.36
		ctor make clear th		0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	530/1674	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.55
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect t	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	528/1423	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.36	4.55
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect th	ne expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	974/1609	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.23	4.15
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute	e to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	769/1585	3.79	3.88	3.96	3.91	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contribu	ate to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	578/1535	3.95	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.33
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly e	explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	727/1651	4.14	4.42	4.18	4.20	4.36
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancel	led	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.75	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	8	3	3.88	1146/1656	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.88
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures v	well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	816/1586	4.20	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.55
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interest	ted in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	1106/1585	4.60	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.64
3. Was le	cture mat	and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	11	5	3.95	1173/1582	3.87	4.13	4.26	4.35	3.95	
4. Did th	e lecture	what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	8	7	3.86	1235/1575	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.86	
5. Did au	oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:					0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	3.04	3.51	3.94	4.03	****
		on															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute	e to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	3.83	3.52	4.01	4.03	4.17
			raged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1253/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	4.28	3.67
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage fa:	ir and open discussion	16	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1308/1511	3.81	3.71	4.27	4.28	3.50
4. Were s	special to	echniques successi	Eul	16	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
		Laborato	cy														
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate	background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.36	****
		Field Wor	ck														
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute	to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	y understand your	evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	****
		Self Pac															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribute	e to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	****
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 (D A 13		Red	guir	ed f	 or M	 lajor	 s	1	 Graduat	 .е	 0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	7		D B 4						- 5	-) (_
56-83	2		L C 4		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad :	22	Non-	-major	20
84-150	6		4 D 0								•	21-001 9		-)	
Grad.	0		5 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a		enoug	ıh

Other

18

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: KOROSTYSHEVSKIY

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 32

Grad.

3.50-4.00 5

Ρ

I

?

0

1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1145 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							FΥ	00110	ncie	C		Inc	tructor	Course	. Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sec
		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mea
		Genera	_															
	_			om this course	1	0	3	3	14	9	2		1611/1674		4.07	4.27	4.32	3.1
		tor make clear			2	0	2	6	14	7	1		1618/1674		4.24	4.23	4.26	2.9
	_	estions reflec			2	0	4	1	10	11	4		1316/1423		4.38	4.27	4.36	3.3
		ations reflect			2	11	3	2	8	5	1		1569/1609		4.12	4.22	4.23	2.9
_	_	-		what you learned	1	10	4	2	5	6	4		1388/1585		3.88	3.96	3.91	3.1
		-		to what you learned	1	14	3	4	5	5	0		1497/1535		4.17	4.08	4.03	2.
_		system clearly		ained	2	1	2	4	12	6			1520/1651		4.42	4.18	4.20	3.2
_		was class canc		1.1	1	1	0	1	2	23			1566/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	
. How would	a you g	rade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	13	11	Τ	3.32	1448/1656	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10	3
		Lectur	e															
. Were the	instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	3	3	12	9	3	3.20	1528/1586	4.20	4.45	4.43	4.48	3.
		tor seem inter			3	0	0	1	7	11	10		1466/1585		4.69	4.69	4.76	4.
				explained clearly	3	0	2	5	9	13	0	3.14	1490/1582	3.87	4.13	4.26	4.35	3.
		s contribute t			1	2	2	4	10	11	2	3.24	1447/1575	3.96		4.27	4.39	3.
				your understanding	3	19	5	2	3	0	0	1.80	1368/1380	3.04	3.51	3.94	4.03	1.
Did alogo	a diaa	Discus	what was laamad	1.0	0	2	0	7	4	0	2 00	1252/1520	2 02	2 52	4 01	4 02	3.	
				what you learned	19						-		1353/1520		3.52	4.01	4.03	
				ed to participate	19	0	2	1	4	5	1		1403/1515		3.76	4.24	4.28	3.
		_		nd open discussion	19	0	1	2	6	2	2		1394/1511		3.71	4.27	4.28	3. **
. Were spec	cial te	chniques succe	ssiul		19	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	* *
		Labora	tory															
. Did the I	lab inc	rease understa	nding (of the material	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	4.34	* *
. Were you	provide	ed with adequa	te bacl	kground information	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	***	3.15	4.19	4.36	* * :
		Semina																
Were agg	ianed t			e announced theme	29	2	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.07	**:
				dividual attention	30	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 101		****	4.48	4.45	**
. was the	IIISCI UC	cor avarrable	IOI III	ilvidual accention	30	_	U	U		U	U	3.00	, 101			1.10	1.13	
		Field	Work															
. Did field	d exper	ience contribu	te to v	what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	* *
. Did you o	clearly	understand yo	ur evai	luation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	***	3.20	3.93	4.20	* *
		Self	Daced															
Did self-	-naced (what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	**
	_	ions make clea		_	30	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52		4.67	4.26	4.53	**
. Dia scaaj	y quest.	IOIIS MARE CIEA	expected goar	30		U	U		U	U	3.00	, 52		1.07	4.20	4.55		
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n										
redits Earr	ned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
 00-27	 1	A 13		Re	auir	ed f	or M	aior	 `s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or			
28-55	5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	B 8		110	-1~-1	- L	J_ 11	⊥ ∪ ر د.	_	-	Siddad	-	-			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C 6		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad 3	32	Non-	-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1		00.	c. a	-				_	onder g			14011	ـــال م	۷.	
:-T20	5	3.00-3.49	5	υ Т														

Electives

Other

3

25

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Title Instructor: PITTENGER, ARTH

Enrollment: 53

Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1146 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equen	cie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	29	4.63	458/1674	4.09	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	25	4.53	554/1674	4.11	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	31	4.77	250/1423	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.36	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	490/1609	3.99	4.12	4.22	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	1	7	8	7	3.91	893/1585	3.79	3.88	3.96	3.91	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	578/1535	3.95	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	12	19	4.26	866/1651	4.14	4.42	4.18	4.20	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1673	4.75	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	12	19	4.40	522/1656	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	31	4.74	517/1586	4.20	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	453/1585	4.60	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	8	8	22	4.31	882/1582	3.87	4.13	4.26	4.35	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	11	25	4.49	717/1575	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	26	3	0	3	1	6	3.54	1024/1380	3.04	3.51	3.94	4.03	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	810/1520	3.83	3.52	4.01	4.03	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	594/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	788/1511	3.81	3.71	4.27	4.28	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	29	7	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor:

PITTENGER, ARTH

Enrollment:

53 Questionnaires: 40 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1146 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	Α	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	2						

University of Maryland INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR Baltimore County

Title Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 30 Fall 2005

Page 1147 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

•			_	~						_				<u>.</u> .
Ouestions	MD	NA	fre 1	eque: 2	ncie 3	es 4	5	Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Mean		Level Mean	Sect
													·	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	15	11	4.23	979/1674	4.09	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	15	4.40	737/1674		4.24	4.23	4.26	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	15	14	4.43	660/1423		4.38	4.27	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	715/1609		4.12	4.22	4.23	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	4	5	11	4.04			3.88	3.96	3.91	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	11	8	4.42			4.17	4.08	4.03	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	,		4.42	4.18	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	15	4	3.96	1039/1656	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	13	13		1104/1586		4.45	4.43	4.48	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	811/1585		4.69	4.69	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	11	11		1099/1582		4.13	4.26	4.35	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	14	12	4.23	975/1575		4.23	4.27	4.39	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	887/1380	3.04	3.51	3.94	4.03	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	734/1520	3.83	3.52	4.01	4.03	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1024/1515	3.84	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	917/1511	3.81	3.71	4.27	4.28	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.36	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	29	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 25 ? 1

Course-Section: MATH 225 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: CAMPBELL, ROBER

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1148

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	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	1	19	8	4.10	1115/1674	4.00	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	10	11	4.00	1146/1674	3.66	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	660/1423	3.97	4.38	4.27	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	2	5	8	6	3.86	1254/1609	3.64	4.12	4.22	4.23	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	742/1585	4.04	3.88	3.96	3.91	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	691/1535	4.04	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	458/1651	4.21	4.42	4.18	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	4	14	6	4.00	955/1656	3.44	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	12	11	4.21	1176/1586	4.38	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	917/1585	4.47	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	11	10	3	3.39	1444/1582	3.45	4.13	4.26	4.35	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	6	8	8	3.54	1361/1575	3.72	4.23	4.27	4.39	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	4	7	4	4	0	2.42	1335/1380	2.51	3.51	3.94	4.03	2.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	1445/1520	2.75	3.52	4.01	4.03	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	2	3	0	6		1137/1515	3.45	3.76	4.24	4.28	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	3	0	7	4.18	962/1511	3.69	3.71	4.27	4.28	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 994	***	3.77	3.94	3.98	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 225 0201 University of Maryland Page 1149 Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
		General	-					_	_	_	_							
_	_	v insights,skil			0	0	0	2	1	5	1		1495/1674				4.32	
		or make clear			0	0	1	2	2	3	1		1597/1674		4.24	4.23	4.26	3.11
	_	estions reflect		_	0	0	0	2	2	2			1214/1423		4.38	4.27	4.36	3.67
		ations reflect			0	2	0	1	4	2	0		1541/1609	3.64	4.12	4.22	4.23	3.14
	_	_		what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	2		956/1585		3.88	3.96	3.91	3.86
				o what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2			1207/1535		4.17	4.08	4.03	3.67
		system clearly	_	ined	1	0	0	0	3	2	3		1097/1651		4.42	4.18	4.20	4.00
		vas class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	8		1/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	
9. How wou	ıld you gr	rade the overal	.I teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	3	U	3.00	1540/1656	3.44	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.00
		T																
1 77		Lecture		1	0	^	^	0	2	2	4 12	1007/1506	4 20	4 4 5	4 42	4 40	4 12	
		ctor's lectures		1	0	0	0	1	3	3		1237/1586		4.45	4.43	4.48	4.13	
		n the subject	1	0	1	0		3 3	4		1328/1585		4.69	4.69	4.76	4.38		
		_		xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	3 4	-	1		1448/1582		4.13	4.26		3.38
		contribute to		•	1	7	0	0	0	3	_		1343/1575		4.23	4.27		3.63
5. Did aud	ilovisual	techniques enr	lance y	our understanding	1	/	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/1380	2.51	3.51	3.94	4.03	
		Discuss	ıi on															
1 Did ala	aa diaana			what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2 50	****/1520	2 75	2 52	4.01	4 02	****
				d to participate	7	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/1515		3.76	4.01	4.03	****
		_	_	d to participate d open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/1511		3.76	4.24	4.28	***
		chniques succes		d Open discussion	7	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 994				3.98	****
4. Were st	pecial tec	simiques succes	ssiui		,	_	U		U	U	U	2.00	/ JJ4		3.11	3.34	3.90	
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83							nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	4-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0							ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	βh

Other

7

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

Course-Section: MATH 225 0301 University of Maryland Page 1150 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Ēπ	001101	ncie	a .		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Love	Coat
O combilers a	NTD	377	1	-		5	_				-			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	854/1674	4.00	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1298/1674	3.66	4.24	4.23	4.26	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1155/1423	3.97	4.38	4.27	4.36	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	0	6	4	3.92	1211/1609	3.64	4.12	4.22	4.23	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	584/1585	4.04	3.88	3.96	3.91	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	703/1535	4.04	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	1057/1651	4.21	4.42	4.18	4.20	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	7	4	1	3.31	1455/1656	3.44	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.38	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	1383/1585	4.47	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1381/1582	3.45	4.13	4.26	4.35	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1138/1575	3.72	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1311/1380	2.51	3.51	3.94	4.03	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1424/1520	2.75	3.52	4.01	4.03	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1420/1515	3.45	3.76	4.24	4.28	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1383/1511	3.69	3.71	4.27	4.28	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
				_					_					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	0						

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: ALLEN, KEVIN

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1151 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	•	-	-	0	0.5	4 60	450/1654	4 01	4 0 0	4 05	4 20	4 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0 1	0	0	1	1 2	8 12	25 20	4.63	458/1674		4.07	4.27	4.32	4.63
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	1	0	12	22	4.53 4.57	554/1674 493/1423		4.24	4.23	4.26 4.36	4.53 4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	4	8	5		1061/1609		4.12	4.27	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	851/1585		3.88	3.96	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	373/1535		4.17	4.08	4.03	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2		19	4.49	553/1651	3.93	4.42	4.18	4.20	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	465/1656	3.65	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	474/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	10	25	4.71	1002/1585	4.54	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	557/1582	3.71	4.13	4.26	4.35	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	24	4.63	551/1575		4.23	4.27	4.39	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	27	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/1380	2.80	3.51	3.94	4.03	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1520	2.90	3.52	4.01	4.03	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	1	0	0	5		****/1515		3.76	4.24	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	0	0	1	4		****/1511	3.13	3.71	4.27	4.28	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	3.40	4.46	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		4.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.33	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35		****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27				
				2	0						

MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Title MINKOFF, SUSAN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 61 Questionnaires: 41 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1152 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Companies No.				Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course 2. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did which evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did written evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Be would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments contribute to wat you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written assignments out the overall teaching of the written assignments of the written asa	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course 2. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did which evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did written evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Be would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments contribute to wat you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written assignments out the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written assignments out the overall teaching of the written assignments of the written asa															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 12 16 13 4.02 1132/1674 4.01 4.24 4.23 4.26 4.02 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 16 1 1 10 3 9 3.75 1320/1609 3.71 4.12 4.22 4.23 3.75 6. Did analysing contribute to what you learned 5. Did analysing contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Nas the grading system clearly explained 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 2 14 13 5 3.62 1324/1656 3.85 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.62 13.00 1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 6 18 16 4.20 84/1422 4.14 4.38 4.27 4.36 4.20 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 0 3 3, 375 1320/1609 3.71 4.12 4.22 4.23 4.33 7.5 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 2 10 6 10 3.67 112/1585 3.74 4.18 4.22 4.23 3.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 3 6 13 17 4.05 104/1515 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.20 4.05 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 3 6 13 17 4.05 104/1515 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.20 4.05 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 4 25 4.64 1093/1673 4.07 4.07 4.09 4.05 4.05 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 2 14 13 5 3.62 1324/1655 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.62 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 1 0 6 14 19 4.20 1101/1606 4.21 4.05 4.05 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07			-	-	•										
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Do 0. D			-												
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Ecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5. Did addivisual techniques enhance your understanding 5. Did addivisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. So 8 10 7 2 2.79 1284/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.69 4.76 4.78 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79 4.79		0	0	-	_			16							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. 0 0 0 1 14 25 4.64 1093/1673 4.87 4.74 4.69 4.67 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. 0 0 0 1 14 25 4.64 1093/1673 4.87 4.74 4.69 4.67 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. 0 0 0 1 14 25 4.64 1093/1673 4.87 4.74 4.69 4.67 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Were all students activally encouraged to participate 2 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were special techniques successful 1. Were special techniques successful 1. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the amnounced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the amnounced theme 1. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 2. Were provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/255 ***.3.54 0.43 4.34 ***. 1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 4. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 4. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 4. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 4. Did the l		1	16			10	3	9	3.75	1320/1609	3.71	4.12	4.22	4.23	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 3 6 13 17 4.05 1064/1651 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.20 4.05 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 14 13 5 3.66 1324/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 3.62 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 1 1 6 14 19 4.20 1191/1586 4.21 4.45 4.43 4.48 4.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 1 1 6 12 14 8 3.54 1395/1582 3.71 4.13 4.65 4.69 4.76 4.78 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 1 1 6 12 14 8 3.54 1395/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.69 4.76 4.78 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 1 6 12 14 8 9 19 4.00 1381/1575 4.04 4.23 4.29 4.03 5 10 class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 2 4 8 9 19 4.00 1385/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.39 4.00 5 10 class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1 2 4 8 9 19 4.00 1385/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.28 4.35 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 2 4 8 9 19 4.00 1385/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.03 3.00 8 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 888/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 8 0 10 class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 1 2 4 0 4.35 8.88/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 10 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 2 4 0 4.35 8.88/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 13 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		0		2			6	10	3.67	1121/1585	3.74	3.88	3.96	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled															
Recommendation Reco			-												
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. B S B 11 7 2 2.79 1284/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 2.79 Discussion 7. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0.3 2 4 4 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 808/1515 4.55 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0.3 2 4 4 0 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 808/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 3 2 4 4 3 3.13 1400/1511 3.13 3.71 4.72 4.28 4.35 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/798 *** 3.15 4.19 4.36 *** 9. Were provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/728 *** 3.15 4.19 4.36 *** 9. Were recessary materials available for lab activities 38 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/728 *** 3.15 4.19 4.36 *** 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				-											
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 6 14 19 4.20 1191/1586 4.21 4.45 4.34 4.48 4.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 12 14 8 3.54 1395/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.35 3.54 4. Hold the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 4 8 9 19 4.00 1138/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.39 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8 5 8 11 7 2 2.79 1284/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 2.79 Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Objects of the instructor encourage to participate 24 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 808/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 3.14 4.28 4.35 4.34 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.39 4.00 4.39 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	14	13	5	3.62	1324/1656	3.65	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.62
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 6 14 19 4.20 1191/1586 4.21 4.45 4.34 4.48 4.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 12 14 8 3.54 1395/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.35 3.54 4. Hold the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 4 8 9 19 4.00 1138/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.39 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8 5 8 11 7 2 2.79 1284/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 2.79 Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Objects of the instructor encourage to participate 24 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 808/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 3.14 4.28 4.35 4.34 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38 4.39 4.00 4.39 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	Logturo														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 6 1 7 33 4.78 853/1585 4.54 4.69 4.69 4.76 4.78 4.51 1.78 1.78 1.78 1.78 1.78 1.78 1.78 1.7		Λ	Λ	1	1	6	1.4	10	4 20	1101/1506	4 21	4 45	4 43	4 49	4 20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 6 12 14 8 3.54 1395/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.35 3.54 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 4 8 9 19 4.00 1138/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.39 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8 5 8 11 7 2 2.79 1284/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 2.79 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 6 1 2 3 5 3.00 1353/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.03 3.00 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 2.79 1.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. 8 5 8 11 7 2 2.79 1284/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 2.79 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 6 1 2 3 5 3.00 1353/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.03 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 808/1515 4.55 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 3 2 4 4 3 3.13 1400/1511 3.13 3.71 4.27 4.28 3.13 4. Were special techniques successful 26 14 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		-	•	-	-		-								
Discussion Discus															
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 6 1 2 3 5 3.00 1353/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.03 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 1 2 4 10 4.35 808/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 3 2 4 4 3 3.13 1400/1511 3.13 3.71 4.27 4.28 3.13 4. Were special techniques successful 26 14 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 269 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 8. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 263 **** 4.20 4.48 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.14 4.63 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0	-														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 6 6 1 2 3 5 3.00 1353/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.03 3.00 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 3 2 4 4 3 3.13 1400/1511 3.13 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 1 4 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 279 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.20 4.48 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.41 4.07 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.41 4.07 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	O	J	O	11	,	2	2.19	1204/1300	2.00	3.31	3.74	1.03	2.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 10 4.35 808/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.28 4.35 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 3 2 4 4 3 3.13 1400/1511 3.13 3.17 4.27 4.28 3.13 4. Were special techniques successful 26 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.24 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 3 2 4 4 3 3.13 1400/1511 3.13 3.71 4.27 4.28 3.13 4.00 ere special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 250 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	6	1	2	3	5	3.00	1353/1520	2.90	3.52	4.01	4.03	3.00
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 1 0 0.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 8. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0 0 0 1 1 0 0.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.20 4.48 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.41 4.07 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.41 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 ***/ 97 **** 4.14 4.63 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 ***/ 97 **** 4.14 4.63 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 ***/ 97 **** 4.14 4.63 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 ***/ 40 **** 4.14 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 ***/ 49 **** 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 ***/ 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 8. Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0.00 ***/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	808/1515	4.35	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.35
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 5 0 ****/ 260 **** 3.40 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 269 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 103 **** **** 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.48 4.45 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	3	2	4	4	3	3.13	1400/1511	3.13	3.71	4.27	4.28	3.13
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 3.14 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 103 **** **** 4.20 4.48 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4. Were special techniques successful	26	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.98	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 39 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 3.14 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 103 **** **** 4.20 4.48 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Lahoratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 3.40 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<u>-</u>	39	1	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 265	****	3 52	4 23	4 34	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 3.40 4.46 4.51 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 39 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 103 **** **** 4.20 4.48 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.41 4.07 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.31 4.33 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				-	-	-		-							****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 39 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 259 **** 3.65 4.33 4.42 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did greeze could you discuss your evaluations 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 4. O 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 4. O 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 4. O 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 4. O 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 4. O 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 ****** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful											****				****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** **** 4.20 4.48 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 103 **** **** 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** **** 4.45 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 8. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.33 4.44 4.22 *****										,					****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** / 103 **** **** 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 101 **** **** 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 95 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 3.00 **** / 97 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** / 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** / 48 **** **** 4.12 4.55 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 239 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** / 103 **** **** 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 101 **** **** 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 95 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 95 **** **** 4.31 4.33 ****															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** **** 4.48 4.45 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.39 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.36 4.63 ****			_		_	_	_								
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 95 **** **** 4.31 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.39 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.63 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ***/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ***/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ***/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ***/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ***/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ***/ 55 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.00 4.00 ***/ 55 ***				-	-			-		,	****				
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned															
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.27 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 4.63 ****	1 3		-					-		,					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.45 4.50 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 40 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.36 4.63 ****	-						-	•							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria		40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations										,	****				****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.27 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.36 4.63 ****								0		,	****	****			****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.36 4.63 ****							0	0			****	****			****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.36 4.63 ****															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 4.63 ****		4.0	^	0	_	_	-	0	4 00	4444/ 63		4 00	4 00	4 00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 4.42 **** 4.44 4.42 4.45 4.46 4.46 4.46 4.46 4.46 4.46 4.46								-		,					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.36 4.63 ****								-							
	-							-		,					
o. were there enough proctors for all the students 40 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ^^^/ 31 ^^^ ^*** 4.34 4.50 ****						-		•		,					
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 31			4.54	4.50	

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: MINKOFF, SUSAN

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1152 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Α	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	18						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	39
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	0						

Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH

Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1153 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	S
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	M
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		General															
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 5 3 7 9 15 3.67 1214/1423 4.14 4.38 4.27 4.35	. Did you	gain new insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	6	2	6	11	14	3.64	1459/1674	4.21	4.07	4.27	4.32	3
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 16 3 3 5 6 6 5 3.22 1504/1609 3.71 4.12 4.22 4.22 1.25 Did assignment contribute to what you learned 1 17 4 1 4 3 9 3.57 1256/1535 4.08 4.17 4.08 4.05 Mass the grading system clearly explained 1 17 4 1 4 3 9 3.57 1256/1535 4.08 4.17 4.08 4.05 Mass the grading system clearly explained 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 35 4.97 212/1651 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.22 4.22 1.22 Mass the grading system clearly explained 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 35 4.97 212/1651 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.22 Movement times was class cancelled 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 35 4.97 212/1651 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.22 Movement the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 Movement the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 35 4.97 212/1653 4.04 4.05 4.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 Movement the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 1 1 8 23 4.13 1448/1585 4.51 4.45 4.49 4.09 4.07 Mass lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 8 6 11 1 4 3.67 1442/1586 4.21 4.45 4.49 4.09 4.07 Movement the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 1 6 3 7 9 3.03 1502/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.35 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 6 3 7 9 3.03 1502/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.35 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 Movement Mov				0	0	6	3	11	5	14	3.46	1515/1674	4.01	4.24	4.23	4.26	3
Did dwritten assignment contribute to what you learned of 19 3 2 3 4 8 3.60 1164/1585 3.74 5.88 3.96 3.97 1391 dwritten assignments contribute to what you learned 1 17 4 1 4 3 9 3.57 1256/1535 4.08 4.17 4.08 4.03 4.08 4.01 4.09 4.61 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09	Did the	exam questions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	5	3	7	9	15	3.67	1214/1423	4.14	4.38	4.27	4.36	3
Did customers contribute to what you learned of 1 17 4 1 4 1 4 3 9 3.57 1256/1535 4.08 4.17 4.08 4.05 was the grading system clearly explained 1 2 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.97 1212/1657 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.22 How many times was class cancelled 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.97 1212/1657 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.22 How many times was class cancelled 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.97 1212/1657 3.83 4.42 4.18 4.22 How many times was class cancelled 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.97 1212/1657 3 4.87 4.74 4.69 4.67 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 How many times was class cancelled 1 1 2 0 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 8 3 10 7 7 8 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.10 How would you grade the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 5 5 3 6 11 1 4 3.67 1442/1586 4.21 4.45 4.43 4.47 4.88 12 4.10 How has a lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 8 6 11 5 9 3.03 1502/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.25 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	Did othe	r evaluations reflect the ϵ	expected goals	1	16	3	3	5	6	5	3.32	1504/1609	3.71	4.12	4.22	4.23	3
Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 9 2 9 6 12 3.26 1522/1651 3.93 4.42 4.18 4.26 4.18 two many times was class cancelled 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 35 4.97 212/1673 4.87 4.74 4.69 4.66 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.16 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.16 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.16 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.16 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 8 3 10 7 4 2.88 1584/1656 3.65 4.00 4.07 4.16 How would you grade the overall teaching 6 10 1 1 1 1 8 23 4.13 1448/1586 4.54 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.6	Did assi	gned readings contribute to	what you learned	0	19	3	2	3	4	8	3.60	1164/1585	3.74	3.88	3.96	3.91	
How many times was class cancelled	Did writ	ten assignments contribute	to what you learned	1	17	4	_	4	3	9	3.57	1256/1535	4.08	4.17	4.08	4.03	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7	Was the	grading system clearly expl	ained	0				9	6	12	3.26	1522/1651	3.93	4.42	4.18	4.20	
Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 5 3 6 11 14 3.67 1442/1586 4.21 4.45 4.46 4.69 4.78 ALE DID TO THE METERS OF THE M	_															4.67	
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	How woul	d you grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	7	0	8	3	10	7	4	2.88	1584/1656	3.65	4.00	4.07	4.10	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 3 4 1 1 8 23 4.13 1448/1585 4.54 4.69 4.69 4.76 was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 8 6 11 5 9 3.03 1502/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.35 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 6 3 7 9 12 3.49 1374/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.35 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.05 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.05 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.05 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 28 0 0 4 1 1 1 1 3 2.80 1424/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.05 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 30 0 3 0 2 2 2 3.00 ****/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.25 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 30 0 3 1 1 0 0 4 3.11 ****/1511 3.13 3.71 4.27 4.25 4.25 Were special techniques successful 28 9 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.95 Did your povided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.36 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/97 **** 4.14 4.65 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.25 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.25 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.25 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.25 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Lecture															
Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 8 6 11 5 9 3.03 1502/1582 3.71 4.13 4.26 4.35 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 6 3 7 9 12 3.49 1374/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.36 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.05 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.05 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29 0 4 1 1 1 3 2.80 1424/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.05 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 30 0 3 0 2 2 2 3.00 ****/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.25 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 30 0 3 1 1 0 4 3.11 ****/1511 3.13 3.71 4.27 4.26 Were special techniques successful 28 9 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.96 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.36 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/97 **** 4.34 4.26 Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/97 **** 4.39 4.22 Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/97 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.27 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/48 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/48 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/48 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/48 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.55 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.55 Did self-paced system contribute to what you	Were the	instructor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	5	3	6	11	14	3.67	1442/1586	4.21	4.45	4.43	4.48	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 6 3 7 9 12 3.49 1374/1575 4.04 4.23 4.27 4.35 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29 0 4 1 1 1 2 3 2.80 1424/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.03 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 30 0 3 0 2 2 2 2 3.00 ****/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.22 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 30 0 3 1 1 0 4 3.11 ****/1511 3.13 3.77 4.27 4.22 Were special techniques successful 28 9 0 1 1 0 0 0 2.50 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.95 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 978 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.65 Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.12 4.85 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.55 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	Did the	instructor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	3	4	1	8	23	4.13	1448/1585	4.54	4.69	4.69	4.76	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 6 2 2 1 5 2.81 1279/1380 2.80 3.51 3.94 4.03 Discussion	Was lect	ure material presented and	explained clearly	0	0	8	6	11	5	9	3.03	1502/1582	3.71	4.13	4.26	4.35	
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29 0 4 1 1 1 3 2.80 1424/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.03 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 30 0 3 0 2 2 2 3.00 ****/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.22 Were special techniques successful 28 9 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.22 Were special techniques successful 28 9 0 1 1 0 0 0 2.50 ****/994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 78 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.12 4.50 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.80 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.55 Frequency Distribution Addits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Did the	lectures contribute to what	you learned	1	1	6	3	7	9	12	3.49	1374/1575	4.04	4.23	4.27	4.39	
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29 0 4 1 1 1 3 2.80 1424/1520 2.90 3.52 4.01 4.05 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 30 0 3 0 2 2 2 3.00 ****/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.26 10 10 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Did audi	ovisual techniques enhance	your understanding	0	23	6	2	2	1	5	2.81	1279/1380	2.80	3.51	3.94	4.03	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate 30 0 3 0 2 2 2 2 3.00 ****/1515 4.35 3.76 4.24 4.25 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 30 0 3 1 1 0 4 3.11 ****/1511 3.13 3.71 4.27 4.26 Were special techniques successful 28 9 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.96 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Pid you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.12 4.55 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Did study questions make clear the expected Grades Reasons Type Major		Discussion															
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 30 0 3 1 1 0 4 3.11 ****/1511 3.13 3.71 4.27 4.28 Were special techniques successful 28 9 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 3.98 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.22 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.22 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.12 4.55 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.55 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	Did clas	s discussions contribute to	what you learned	29	0	4	1	1	1	3	2.80	1424/1520	2.90	3.52	4.01	4.03	
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 4.36 4	Were all	students actively encourage	ged to participate	30	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	****/1515	4.35	3.76	4.24	4.28	
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.39 4.22 Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.55 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majoratory and the second of the second	Did the	instructor encourage fair a	and open discussion	30	0		1	1	0	4	3.11	****/1511	3.13	3.71	4.27	4.28	
Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 3.52 4.23 4.34 Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 278 **** 3.15 4.19 4.36 Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.39 4.22 Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Pid field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ***/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Pid study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Pid study questions make clear the expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Were spe	cial techniques successful		28	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	***	3.77	3.94	3.98	
Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Laboratory															
Seminar Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.39 4.22 Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.55 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Did the	lab increase understanding	of the material	35	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	4.34	
Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.39 4.22 Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.14 4.63 Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Did study questions make clear the expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Were you	provided with adequate bac	kground information	37	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	***	3.15	4.19	4.36	
### Were criteria for grading made clear		Seminar															
Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Did pres	entations contribute to wha	at you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.22	
Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.10 3.98 3.97 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Were cri	teria for grading made clea	ar	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.20 3.93 4.20 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major		Field Work															
To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.12 4.50 Did conferences help you carry out field activities 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.27 4.82 Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Did fiel	d experience contribute to	what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.10	3.98	3.97	
Self Paced Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.27 4.82	Did you	clearly understand your eva	luation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.20	3.93	4.20	
Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	To what	degree could you discuss yo	our evaluations	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Did conf	erences help you carry out	field activities	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 61 **** 4.09 4.09 4.23 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major																	
Did study questions make clear the expected goal 38 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.67 4.26 4.53 Frequency Distribution edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major					0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	4.09	4.09	4.23	
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	Did study questions make clear the expected goal				0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	***	4.67	4.26	4.53	
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade:						Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					 quir	ed f	or M	 lajor	`====	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MATH 251H 0101 University of Maryland
Title Baltimore County
Instructor: HOFFMAN, KATHLE Fall 2005

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

17

University of Maryland Page 1154
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	432/1674	4.65	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	325/1674		4.24	4.23	4.26	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.38	4.27	4.36	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	567/1609	4.45	4.12	4.22	4.23	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	622/1585	4.18	3.88	3.96	3.91	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	268/1535	4.63	4.17	4.08	4.03	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	956/1651	4.18	4.42	4.18	4.20	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1189/1673	4.53	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	588/1656	4.36	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	474/1586	4.76	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1016/1582	4.18	4.13	4.26	4.35	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	806/1575	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.39	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1094/1380	3.40	3.51	3.94	4.03	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	Λ	0	5	1	4.17	726/1520	4.17	3.52	4.01	4.03	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	2		1024/1515	4.00	3.76	4.24	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.50	3.71	4.27	4.28	4.50
The state of the s		-	-	-	-	-	_		,				0	
_														

Credits Ea	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6	
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	6							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	16					
				2	Λ							

Course-Section: MATH 301 0101 University of Maryland Title

INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 23

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

Page 1155

							Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,sk		m this course	0	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	1085/1674	4.12	4.07	4.27	4.26	4.13
_	-	ctor make clea			0	0	0	2	6	7			1258/1674		4.24	4.23	4.21	3.91
		estions refle			0	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	707/1423		4.38	4.27	4.27	4.39
	_	uations reflec			0	13	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1355/1609	3.80	4.12	4.22	4.27	3.70
				what you learned	0	7	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1049/1585	3.72	3.88	3.96	3.95	3.75
	_	_		o what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	767/1535		4.17	4.08	4.15	4.17
		system clear		-	0	0	0	2	0	4	17	4.57	445/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.16	4.57
8. How man	ny times	was class can	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	924/1656	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.06
		Lectu	re															
1. Were th	ne instri	prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	1191/1586	4.23	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.19		
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	2	8	12		1267/1585		4.69	4.69	4.66	4.45
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	2	6	9	5		1290/1582		4.13	4.26	4.26	3.77
		es contribute			1 2	0	0	1	9	5	6		1284/1575		4.23	4.27		3.76
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cla	ass disci			what you learned	19	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1520	2.80	3.52	4.01	4.09	****
				d to participate	19	0	1	0	2	1	0		****/1515		3.76	4.24		****
		_	_	d open discussion	19	0	1	0	3	0	0		****/1511				4.34	****
				Frequ	ency	. Dis	trib	ut i oi	n									
				11040	iciic j	DID	CIID	uc10.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	D-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor		0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C 7		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 1		Electives					2	#### - Means there			re not	enoug	_j h	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0	Other					1	.9	-						
				? 2														

Course-Section: MATH 301 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1156

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1115/1674	4.12	4.07	4.27	4.26	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1111/1674	3.98	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	792/1423	4.35	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1224/1609	3.80	4.12	4.22	4.27	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1100/1585	3.72	3.88	3.96	3.95	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	870/1535	4.08	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	1031/1651	4.34	4.42	4.18	4.16	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	424/1673	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	955/1656	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	10	7	4.28	1128/1586	4.23	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1071/1585	4.56	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1320/1582	3.75	4.13	4.26	4.26	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	2	10	4.11	1090/1575	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1380	****	3.51	3.94	4.01	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1424/1520	2.80	3.52	4.01	4.09	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,		3.76	4.24	4.32	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	,	4.20	3.71	4.27	4.34	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994			3.94	3.96	***
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 9			quir	ed f	 or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	 e	 1	Majo	 r	 9

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA		Earned Cum. GPA Expec				Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	9		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4								
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0								
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n		
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	13						
				2	E								

Course-Section: MATH 302 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: GOWDA, MUDDAPPA

Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1157

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	735/1674	4.43	4.07	4.27	4.26	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	495/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	623/1423	4.46	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1048/1609	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	3.88	3.96	3.95	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	655/1535	4.26	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	19	4.41	658/1651	4.41	4.42	4.18	4.16	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.69	4.69	4.66	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	199/1582	4.85	4.13	4.26	4.26	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	24	4.78	327/1575	4.78	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	****/1380	***	3.51	3.94	4.01	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/1520	****	3.52	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1515	****	3.76	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	****/1511	****	3.71	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	3.96	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	6
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27	=			
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 381 0101 University of Maryland Page 1158 Title LIN. METH/OPER RESEARC Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fi	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.07	4.27	4.26	4.80
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.20
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.75
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.25
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	3.88	3.96	3.95	****
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.17	4.08	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	lained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.42	4.18	4.16	4.80
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.33
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	753/1586	4.60	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.13	4.26	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.25	4.60
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	***	3.51	3.94	4.01	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.52	4.01	4.09	4.00
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1303/1515	3.50	3.76	4.24	4.32	3.50
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1420/1511	3.00	3.71	4.27	4.34	3.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MATH 401 0101 Page 1159 Title MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 GOWDA, MUDDAPPA Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

C	uestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
~	acberonnaries.	±	Deddelle	COULDC	DValuation	Queberonnarie

Enrollment:

1

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.07	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.24	4.23	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1423	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.88	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.42	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.00	4.07	4.19	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1585	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1582	5.00	4.13	4.26	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.35	5.00
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.52	4.01	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.76	4.24	4.40	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.71	4.27	4.45	4.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									

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

Course-Section: MATH 404 0101

Title INTRO PART DIFF EQ I

Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 24

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Fall 2005
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1160

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	que	ncies			Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	N	IR I	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	k		Mean		Mean	Mean
General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cou	11700	1	0	2	1	10	4	6	2 /0	1521/1	671	2 /10	4.07	4.27	4.42	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goa		1	0	0	4	9	4	6		1489/1			4.07	4.27	4.42	3.52
			-	-												
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected go		0	0	0	3	3	5		4.17			4.17		4.27	4.34	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goa		2	4	0	0	4	7	7	4.17				4.12	4.22		4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you l		2	0	5	2	4	4	7		1356/1		3.27	3.88	3.96	4.01	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you		2	1	2	0	3	7	9	4.00	870/1		4.00	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		3	0	1	0	3				889/1		4.24	4.42	4.18	4.23	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled		4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1		5.00		4.69		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effect	ctiveness	7	1	2	5	5	3	1	2.75	1599/1	656	2.75	4.00	4.07	4.19	2.75
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		1	0	0	2	2	5	14	4.35	1064/1	586	4.35	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subj		1	0	0	0	1	1			664/1		4.87	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained of		1	0	6	6	3	4			1550/1			4.13	4.26		2.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	_	0	0	6	3	4	5			1476/1			4.23	4.27		3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unders		0	2	9	3	3	4			1324/13			3.51			2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unders	standing	U	2	9	3	3	4	3	2.50	1324/1.	380	2.50	3.51	3.94	4.04	2.50
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you l		.3	0	4	1	3	1	2	2.64	1459/1	520	2.64	3.52	4.01	4.18	2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to parti	icipate 1	.3	0	6	1	2	0	2	2.18	1488/1	515	2.18	3.76	4.24	4.40	2.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open dis	scussion 1	.4	0	4	1	2	1	2	2.60	1472/1	511	2.60	3.71	4.27	4.45	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	.2	9	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	994	****	3.77	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory																
2. Were you provided with adequate background inf	formation 2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/	278	****	3.15	4.19	4.21	****
Field Work	1 0		•		0	1	•	0	0 00	ale ale ale ale 1		de de de de	2 10	2 00	4 06	ale ale ale ale
1. Did field experience contribute to what you le		2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	76	****	3.10	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation cri		1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/	77	****	3.20	3.93	4.24	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****
Self Paced																
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you l	learned 2	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/	61	****	4.09	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected go	oal 2	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	52	****	4.67	4.26	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/	50	****	4.33	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
	Frequen	ıcv I	Dist	ribu	tio	n										
	_	-1		_~~												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expecte	ed Grades				Rea	asons					Typ	e			Majors	\$
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A	 6		Regi	uire	d f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Gradı	uate	1	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B	12		_											_		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C	2		Gene	eral					3	Unde	r-gr	ad 1	4	Non-	major	23
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D	0														3	
Grad. 10 3.50-4.00 4 F	0		Ele	ctiv	es				0	####	- N	leans t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh
P	0		_									s to b			_	•
I	0		Ot.he	er				1	8			2				
?	0		0 021					_	-							
·	•															

Course-Section: MATH 407 0101 University of Maryland

Page 1161 Title MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: HORTA, ARNALDO Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

	,	
Enrollment:	21	
	1 -	

Questionnaires: 15

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	new insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	671/1674	4.47	4.07	4.27	4.42	4.47
	1 0	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	379/1674		4.24	4.23	4.31	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	286/1423		4.38	4.27	4.34	4.73
		uations reflect		_	0	8	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	812/1609		4.12	4.22	4.30	4.29
				what you learned	0	5	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	907/1585		3.88	3.96	4.01	3.90
				o what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	508/1535		4.17	4.08	4.18	4.40
		ng system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73			4.42	4.18	4.23	4.73
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673		4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	838/1656	4.15	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.15
		Lectur						_	_	_			005/4505					
		ructor's lecture			0	0	0	1	1		11		,		4.45	4.43	4.46	4.53
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.87	,		4.69	4.69	4.76	4.87
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	1	0 1	0	5	9	4.40	,		4.13	4.26	4.31	
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	_	0			4.60	579/1575		4.23	4.27	4.35	4.60
5. Did	audiovisua	il techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	13	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1380	****	3.51	3.94	4.04	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	645/1520	4.25	3.52	4.01	4.18	4.25
2. Were	e all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.76	4.24	4.40	4.50
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1511	4.50	3.71	4.27	4.45	4.50
		echniques succe			11	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	4.19	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	guir	 ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7						. ,		-		-	-) ~		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Gei	nera	l				4	Under-q	rad 1	L5	Non-	-major	5
84-150		3.00-3.49	4	D 0									2		-		5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Ot1	her					9						
				? 0														

Course-Section: MATH 410 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO COMPLEX ANALYSIS Baltimore County

Instructor: PITTENGER, ARTH

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 15 Fall 2005

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1162 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 2 11 4.53 570/1674 4.53 4.07 4.27 4.42 4.53 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 215/1674 4.80 4.24 4.23 4.31 4.80 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 13 4.87 160/1423 4.87 4.38 4.27 4.34 4.87 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 567/1609 4.45 4.12 4.22 4.30 4.45 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 642/1585 4.17 3.88 3.96 4.01 4.17 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5 0 0 2 4 3 4.11 817/1535 4.11 4.17 4.08 4.18 4.117. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 6 6 4.29 832/1651 4.29 4.42 4.18 4.23 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 14 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.74 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 0 1 3 9 4.36 588/1656 4.36 4.00 4.07 4.19 4.36 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 663/1586 4.67 4.45 4.43 4.46 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1585 5.00 4.69 4.69 4.76 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 2 1 11 4.64 467/1582 4.64 4.13 4.26 4.31 4.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 3 10 4.53 658/1575 4.53 4.23 4.27 4.35 4.53 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 13 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1380 **** 3.51 3.94 4.04 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1520 **** 3.52 4.01 4.18 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1515 **** 3.76 4.24 4.40 **** 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1511 **** 3.71 4.27 4.45 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 13 1 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 4.19 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	3						

Course-Section: MATH 426 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB Baltimore County
Instructor: SOANE, ANA MARI Fall 2005

University of Maryland Page 1163
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11	
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean M	ept UMBC	Level	Sect
	ean Mean	Mean	Mean
General			
	.07 4.27	4.42	4.86
	24 4.23		4.86
	38 4.27	4.34	4.86
	12 4.22	4.30	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 1352/1585 3.29 3	.88 3.96	4.01	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 131/1535 4.80 4	17 4.08	4.18	4.80
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	42 4.18	4.23	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4	74 4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 $493/1656$ 4.43 4	.00 4.07	4.19	4.43
Lecture			
	45 4.43	4.46	5.00
	69 4.69		5.00
	13 4.26		4.86
	.23 4.27		4.86
	51 3.94		
Discussion			
	.52 4.01	4.18	5.00
	76 4.24		3.50
	.70 4.24		****
	.71 4.27		****
Frequency Distribution			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type		Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1	 Мај	or	 6
of 2. The state of	1.00	Ü-	J
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	Non	-major	1
28-55			_
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 6			
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 6 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	e are no	t enous	яh
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 6 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			дh

Course-Section: MATH 430 0101 University of Maryland MATRIX ANALYSIS ZWECK, JOHN

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

29

Page 1164 Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionna	ire

									_	ncies				tructor		_		Level	
		Questions	3			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		this course		0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	655/1674	4.47	4.07	4.27	4.42	4.47
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	554/1674		4.24	4.23		4.53
		estions reflect				0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	878/1423		4.38	4.27		4.21
		ations reflect				1	4	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	812/1609	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.30	4.29
		eadings contrib			ned	0	3	0	0		7	6	4.19				3.96	4.01	4.19
		signments contr				2	6	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	260/1535	4.64	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.64
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned		2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	741/1651	4.35	4.42	4.18	4.23	4.35
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled			2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effective	eness	2	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	667/1656	4.29	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.29
1. Were th	Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	4	15	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.79
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	- ,		4.69	4.69	4.76	4.89
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject. . Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	,		4.13	4.26		4.61
		es contribute to			2	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	537/1575	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.63
		l techniques enl	_		ding	2	14	1	0	0	0	2		****/1380		3.51		4.04	****
		Discus																	
1 Did ala		Discus: ussions contrib		hat man laam	nad	1 2	0	0	2	1	2	1	2 22	1252/1520	3.33	3.52	4.01	4.18	3.33
		issions contrib its actively en		-		13 13	0	0	1	1	1	_		1024/1515		3.52 3.76	4.01	4.18	4.00
		its actively end ctor encourage :				13	0	1	0	2	2			1351/1511	3.33	3.76	4.24	4.40	3.33
		ctor encourage . echniques succe		open discus	SION	13	4	0	0	2				****/ 994					3.33 ****
4. Were St	peciai te	echniques succes	SSLUI			13	4	U	U	۷	U	U	3.00	/ 994		3.77	3.94	4.19	
		Labora	-																
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequat	te backg	round informa	ation	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.21	****
					Freque	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
									_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Gi	rades 				Re:	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A 9			Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	11
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6																		
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 1						Ger	nera	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ιh
	P 1													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0			Otl	ner				1	.1						
				? 1															

Course-Section: MATH 441 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS Baltimore County

Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI Fall 2005

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1165

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.07	4.27	4.42	4.25
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.75
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.12	4.22	4.30	4.75
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.88	3.96	4.01	3.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.18	5.00
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.42	4.18	4.23	5.00
8. How man	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effective							0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.75		
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.13	4.26	4.31	4.50
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.50
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	902/1380	3.75	3.51	3.94	4.04	3.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.52	4.01	4.18	3.00
2. Were a	11 stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.76	4.24	4.40	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.71	4.27	4.45	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	3			Туј	pe			Majors	5
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majo						3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	General							1	TTm d and and		4	Mari		0
56-83 84-150	0 3	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	1 0	C 1 D 0	General							1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0
						ריים	ecti					0	инии -	Moona t	homo -	n-+		-h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	3	P 0		ЕI	ectl	ves				U	#### - 1 respons					111
				I 0	Other							3	I CBPOIIB		oc bigi	ııı.caı.		

? 0

Course-Section: MATH 479 0101

Title MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S

Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1166 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	891/1674	4.30	4.07	4.27	4.42	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1001/1674	4.20	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.38	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	353/1609	4.63	4.12	4.22	4.30	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	***	3.88	3.96	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	454/1535	4.44	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	208/1651	4.78	4.42	4.18	4.23	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.13	4.26	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	****	3.51	3.94	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	****	3.52	4.01	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1515		3.76	4.24	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	****	3.71	4.27	4.45	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	q	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 97		****	4.14	4.46	****
From														

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

Course-Section: MATH 486 0101

Title INTRO TO DYNAMICAL SYS

Instructor: HOFFMAN, KATHLE

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2005

Page 1167 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Frequencies I					Inst	cructor	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	1	0	7		703/1674		4.07		4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	6		1146/1674	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	5		1016/1423	4.00	4.38	4.27		4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.12	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	1	2		1164/1585	3.60	3.88	3.96	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.33
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	0	1	8		127/1651	4.89	4.42	4.18	4.23	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3		1361/1673	4.33	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4 70	453/1586	4.78	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.78
± ±		-	0	0	1	1	7		,					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	-	0	7	Ţ	1		1071/1585	4.67	4.69 4.13	4.69	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	-	3 1		4		1070/1582	4.11		4.26		4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	Τ	0	_	1	6		983/1575	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	U	0	Τ	Τ	2.75	1290/1380	2.75	3.51	3.94	4.04	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	4.67	3.52	4.01	4.18	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.67	3.76	4.24	4.40	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.71	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.21	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260		3.40	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	3.65	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.10	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0	Eleccives		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-	_		
				2	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MATH 490A 0101 Page 1168 Title INTRO TO GAME THEORY JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM

Enrollment:	8		
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	735/1674	4.43	4.07	4.27	4.42	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1305/1674	3.86	4.24	4.23	4.31	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.38	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.12	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	956/1585	3.86	3.88	3.96	4.01	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.42	4.18	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1457/1582	3.33	4.13	4.26	4.31	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1329/1575	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.51	3.94	4.04	4.00
Frequency Distribution														

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

Course-Section: MATH 490B 0101 University of Maryland Title NUM SOL PARTIAL DIFF E

Instructor: MINKOFF, SUSAN

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

Page 1169 Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.07	4.27	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1674	4.90	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1423	4.89	4.38	4.27	4.34	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	96/1585	4.89	3.88	3.96	4.01	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1535	4.89	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1651	4.90	4.42	4.18	4.23	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1040/1673	4.70	4.74	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	345/1656	4.56	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1582	4.90	4.13	4.26	4.31	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	171/1575	4.90	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	612/1380	4.11	3.51	3.94	4.04	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.52	4.01	4.18	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1515	4.67	3.76	4.24	4.40	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	507/1511	4.67	3.71	4.27	4.45	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4 4	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.77	3.94	4.19	5.00

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

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland Page 1170 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MATH 601 0101

MEASURE THEORY

GOWDA, MUDDAPPA

Title

Instructor:

NR	NΔ		-			5				_			Sect Mean
-	-	•		•									4.94
													4.94
													4.56
					_								4.80
													4.13
-	_	-	-	_	-								4.75
													5.00
1	1	0	0	1	-							4.15	4.79
_			_	_									
-					-								4.88
-													5.00
													4.88
													4.88
1	8	U	U	U	U	/	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.51	3.94	3.85	5.00
10	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.52	4.01	4.19	4.00
10	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.76	4.24	4.47	4.00
10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1511	4.33	3.71	4.27	4.49	4.33
10	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	4.07	****
15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.56	****
	0			0	0	1		,	****	****			****
15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.54	***
15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	***	****	4.14	4.26	****
1 5	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 76	****	2 10	2 00	4 20	****
					-	_		,					***
					-			,					***
		-		-	-	_		,					***
15	0	0	0	0	0	_		, 10		****		4.46	***
								,					
				-		1		,				4.46	***
						_		,					****
					-			,					****
								,					****
15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
uency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
			Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 15 0 0	NR NA 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 0 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 4 0 1 0 0 2 0 1 4 0 1 0 0 2 0 1 4 0 1 0 0 2 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 12 0 1 0 0 0 3 12 0 0 2 0 1 4 9 0 1 0 0 2 0 13 0 0 0 1 0 1 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 7 10 0 0 1 1 1 3 10 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4 0 0 0 0 1 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 12 4.56 0 1 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 0 0 2 0 1 4 9 4.13 0 1 0 0 2 0 13 4.73 0 0 0 1 0 1 14 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.79 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 12 4.79 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 12 4.79 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 12 4.88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.88 1 8 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 10 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.00 10 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 10 4 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 103/1674 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 2 12 4.56 505/1423 0 1 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 173/1609 0 0 2 0 1 4 9 4.13 682/1585 0 1 0 0 2 0 13 4.73 184/1535 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 14 4.75 231/1651 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 14 4.75 231/1651 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.79 163/1656 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5 4.88 266/1586 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5 4.88 203/1575 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 180/1582 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 180/1582 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 1 8 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1380 10 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.00 810/1520 10 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 816/1511 10 4 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 103/1674 4.94 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 12 4.56 505/1423 4.56 0 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3 4.73 184/1535 4.73 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 4 4.75 231/1651 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.80 173/1609 4.80 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.75 231/1651 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 2 4.79 163/1656 4.79 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 2 4.79 163/1656 4.79 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 266/1586 4.88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1585 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.88 203/1575 4.88 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1380 5.00 10 0 0 1 1 1 2 3 4.33 816/1511 4.33 10 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 994 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 994 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 994 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 997 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 15 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 103/1674 4.94 4.07 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 12 4.56 505/1423 4.56 4.38 0 1 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 173/1609 4.80 4.12 0 0 0 2 0 1 4 9 4.13 682/1585 4.13 3.88 0 1 0 0 0 2 1 1 4 9 4.13 682/1585 4.13 3.88 0 1 0 0 0 2 1 1 4 9 4.13 682/1585 4.13 3.88 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 14 4.75 231/1651 4.75 4.42 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 14 4.75 231/1651 4.75 4.42 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 166 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.74 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 12 4.79 163/1656 4.79 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 266/1586 4.88 4.45 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 166 5.00 1/1585 5.00 4.69 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1380 5.00 3.51 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.00 810/1520 4.00 3.52 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1380 5.00 3.51 10 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.33 816/1511 4.33 3.71 10 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 199 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 199 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 199 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 199 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 197 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 197 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 197 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 197 **** 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 197 ***** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 197 ***** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 197 ***** 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 101 **** **** 15 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 103/1674 4.94 4.07 4.27 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 12 4.56 505/1423 4.56 4.38 4.27 0 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 4 9 4.13 682/1585 4.13 3.88 3.96 0 1 0 0 2 0 1 4 9 4.13 682/1585 4.13 3.88 3.96 0 1 0 0 2 0 1 4 9 4.13 682/1585 4.13 3.88 3.96 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 14 4.75 231/1651 4.75 4.42 4.18 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 14 4.75 231/1651 4.75 4.42 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 12 4.79 163/1656 4.79 4.00 4.07 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 266/1586 4.88 4.45 4.43 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 3 4.00 810/1520 4.00 3.51 3.94 10 0 0 1 1 1 2 3 4.33 816/1511 4.33 3.71 4.27 10 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 994 **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.41 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.33 4.44 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.36 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 30 *** 4.34 10 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 103/1674 4.94 4.07 4.27 4.44 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 12 4.56 505/1423 4.56 4.38 4.27 4.28 0 1 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 173/1609 4.80 4.12 4.22 4.34 0 0 0 1 0 0 2 0 13 4.73 184/1535 4.73 4.17 4.08 4.27 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 14 4.75 231/1651 4.75 4.42 4.18 4.32 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 12 2 4.79 163/1656 4.79 4.00 4.07 4.15 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.88 266/1586 4.88 4.45 4.43 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.88 266/1586 4.88 4.45 4.43 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.88 266/1586 4.88 4.45 4.43 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 266/1586 4.88 4.45 4.43 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 266/1586 4.88 4.45 4.43 4.50 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 4.30 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.23 4.27 4.30 1 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 15 5 4.88 203/1575 4.88 4.45 4.44 4.49 10 0 0 1 1 1 1 2 3 4.00 810/1520 4.00 3.52 4.01 4.19 10 0 0 1 1 1 1 3 4.00 810/1520 4.00 3.52 4.01 4.19 10 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.33 816/1511 4.33 3.71 4.27 4.49 10 4 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 816/1511 4.33 3.71 4.27 4.49 10 4 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.77 3.94 4.07 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.41 4.56 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 99 **** **** 4.41 4.26 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.49 4.49 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.49 4.49 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.43 4.44 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.44 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.44 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.44 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.09 4.09 4.46 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.09 4.09 4.46 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.44 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.09 4.09 4.69 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 4

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	e are not enough		

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 7 .

Course-Section: MATH 620 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

NUMERICAL ANALYSIS I GOBBERT, MATTHI

Instructor: Enrollment:

13 Questionnaires: 8 Fall 2005

Page 1171 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions 					Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills	from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.07	4.27	4.44	4.2
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear th	e expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.6
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect t	he expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.7
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect th	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	136/1609	4.88	4.12	4.22	4.34	4.8
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	167/1585	4.75	3.88	3.96	4.23	4.7
5. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribu	te to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1535	4.86	4.17	4.08	4.27	4.8
'. Was th	e grading	g system clearly e	xplained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.42	4.18	4.32	5.0
3. How ma	ny times	was class cancell	ed	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.78	5.0
. How wo	ould you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.0
		Lecture															
l. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	723/1586	4.63	4.45	4.43	4.50	4.6
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interest	ed in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.69	4.69	4.79	4.8
			nd explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/1582	4.63	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.0
		es contribute to w	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.
			ce your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	399/1380		3.51	3.94	3.85	4.
	n																
Discussion . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	955/1520	3.86	3.52	4.01	4.19	3.8
			raged to participate	1 1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	568/1515		3.76	4.24	4.47	4.
			r and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511		3.71	4.27	4.49	4.
		echniques successf		1	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	360/ 994		3.71	3.94	4.07	4.
		Laborator															
Did +h	o lah in		y ng of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	3.52	4.23	4.51	***
			background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	3.15	4.19	4.42	**
			le for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	3.40	4.19	4.67	**:
		structor provide a		7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	3.40	4.33	4.66	**:
		-	ssistance s clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233		****	4.33	4.53	* * *
			Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	ut.io	n									
	_	2															
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3 :			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	8
28-55																	
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0				Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	(
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	= *														
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
			P 0	responses to be sig					oe sign	_							
			I 0		Otl	her					7						
	? 0																

Course-Section: MATH 651 0101 University of Maryland Page 1172 Title OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 3

Fall 2005
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.12	4.22	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.88	3.96	4.23	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.17	4.08	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.42	4.18	4.32	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.74	4.69	4.78	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.45	4.43	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.33

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Course-Section: MATH 688 0101 ABSTRACT ALGEBRA TOLL, CHARLES

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

3

Page 1173 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.07	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.24	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	482/1585	4.33	3.88	3.96	4.23	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.42	4.18	4.32	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.00	4.07	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.13	4.26	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.51	3.94	3.85	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.52	4.01	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	3.76	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.71	4.27	4.49	5.00
Freque	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 1174

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS Enrollment: 8

ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS

Course-Section: MATH 710A 0101

Questionnaires: 7

Title

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions						Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		QuestionsGeneral you gain new insights, skills from this course						2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Di	d you gain r		_	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1075/1674	4.14	4.07	4.27	4.44	4.14
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1043/1674	4.14	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.14
		questions reflec			0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.50
		.uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	985/1609	4.14	4.12	4.22	4.34	4.14
5. Di	d assigned m	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	265/1585	4.60	3.88	3.96	4.23	4.60
6. Di	d written as	signments contr	ibute t	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1535	4.71	4.17	4.08	4.27	4.71
7. Wa	s the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.42	4.18	4.32	4.80
8. Ho	w many times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. Ho	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.00	4.07	4.15	4.40
1 17.		Lectur			0	0	0	^	1	4	2	1 11	1004/1506	1 1 1	4 45	4 42	4 50	1 11
		ructor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0 T	0	2 7	5.00	1224/1586 1/1585		4.45	4.43	4.50	4.14 5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	2				5.00 4.43	4.69	4.69	4.79 4.33	4.43
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	2	4	4.43	1060/1575		4.13	4.26	4.33	4.43
	 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 					6	0	0	0	∠ 1	0		****/1380		4.23	4.27 3.94		4.14 ****
5. DI	a audiovisua	ar techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	О	U	U	U	T	U	4.00	***/1380	***	3.51	3.94	3.85	
		Discus	sion															
1. Di	d class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	3.52	4.01	4.19	***
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	3.76	4.24	4.47	****
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	3.71	4.27	4.49	****
4. We	re special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.77	3.94	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credi	ts Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-2	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors		0	Graduat	e	4	Majo	r .r	5
28-5							1									3		
56-8				C 0		Gei	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	2
	4-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																3 -	
	Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 3									respons				_	
	I O					Ot1	her					1	-					
				? 0														