```
Course Section: MATH 100  0101             University of Maryland                              Page 1088
Title       INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH            Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  JONES, CRISTEN                      Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     47
Questionnaires: 29                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

        General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   4   3   4  13   5 3.41 1520/1669  3.41  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   1   8   9  10 3.90 1242/1666  3.78  4.16  4.19  4.11  3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2  11  15 4.38  710/1421  4.40  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  10   0   1   3   8   7 4.11  970/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6   2   4   5   6   6 3.43 1280/1555  3.44  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11  0   4   2   7   5 3.72 1160/1543  3.67  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   2   9   8  10 3.90 1169/1647  3.88  4.21  4.12  4.06  3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   4  25 4.86  788/1668  4.73  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   3   1  10  10   0 3.13 1490/1605  3.23  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.13

        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   3   2   4  12   5 3.54 1383/1514  3.68  4.39  4.39  4.32  3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   1   2   8  15 4.42 1254/1551  4.16  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   2   0   6  12   6 3.77 1230/1503  3.77  4.03  4.24  4.17  3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   1   2   2  14   7 3.92 1153/1506  3.81  4.16  4.26  4.17  3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  4   7   2   3   8   2 2.82 1183/1311  2.74  3.58  3.85  3.68  2.82

        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0   2   0   1   3   1 3.14 ****/1490  ****  3.53  4.05  3.85  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0   2   2   0   3   1 2.88 1428/1502  2.88  3.78  4.26  4.06  2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0   1   2   0   3   1 3.14 ****/1489  ****  3.76  4.29  4.07  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   22  4   1   0   0   1   1 3.33 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****

        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0  0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****

        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     27  1   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       28  0   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 100  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1089
Title      INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH            Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  JONES, CRISTEN                     Fall  2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     53
Questionnaires:  30                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	9	5	9	3.40	1525/1669	3.41	4.12	4.23	4.02	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	3	13	3.66	1395/1666	3.78	4.16	4.19	4.11	3.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	7	18	4.41	670/1421	4.40	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	3	2	1	13	4.10	970/1617	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	5	1	6	4	9	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	3.83	4.00	3.92	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	2	2	3	8	3.61	1220/1543	3.67	4.06	4.06	3.86	3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	1	11	11	3.86	1196/1647	3.88	4.21	4.12	4.06	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	8	21	4.60	1125/1668	4.73	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	4	8	8	3	3.33	1428/1605	3.23	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	6	6	11	3.81	1303/1514	3.68	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	4	7	4	12	3.89	1446/1551	4.16	4.62	4.66	4.55	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	4	5	12	3.78	1225/1503	3.77	4.03	4.24	4.17	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	4	6	11	3.70	1262/1506	3.81	4.16	4.26	4.17	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	5	2	7	2	2	2.67	1208/1311	2.74	3.58	3.85	3.68	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	****/1502	2.88	3.78	4.26	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/1489	****	3.76	4.29	4.07	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	3.81	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.50	4.36	4.19	****

```
                                    Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1090
Title        ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC          Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  FAGAN, DAVID                    Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      51
Questionnaires: 21                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   2   2   8   7  3.76 1367/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   0   4   5  10  4.15  993/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   1   1   6  12  4.45  632/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   7   1   0   2   5   5  4.00 1029/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  7   1   1   4   3   4  3.62 1170/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12  0  1   3   2   2  3.63 1215/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   1   0   1   4   5   8  4.11  984/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   2   2   8   6   2  3.20 1651/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  3.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 3  0  1   1   5   2  3.89 1108/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.89

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   1   1   1   7   6  4.00 1199/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0   1   0   3   6   5  3.93 1431/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   2   0   4   3   6  3.73 1245/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0   2   1   1   4   7  3.87 1194/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 10  1  1   0   0   3  3.60 ****/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  0  1   1   2   2  3.83  988/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  0  0   0   2   4  4.67  486/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  0   2   1   3  4.17  973/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  4.17
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   5   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0  0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0 0  0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0  0  0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0 0  0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19 0  0  0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0  0  0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0  0  0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

Title   ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 21   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0201                 University of Maryland                              Page 1091
Title       ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC              Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SHEVCHENKO, OLE                    Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      54
Questionnaires: 21                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3   3   3   7   5  3.38 1530/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   1   2   7   9  4.10 1037/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   3   6  11  4.40  683/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8   0   0   2   3   8  4.46  554/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  6   1   0   5   4   4  3.71 1095/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 5  0   2   2   4   5  3.92  994/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   1   2   5  11  4.37  713/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  1   1   4  11   0  3.47 1369/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.47

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   2   0   5  14  4.48  845/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   5  15  4.67 1028/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   2   3   6   9  4.10 1015/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   3   3   4  10  4.05 1047/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13  1   0   2   2   2  3.57  904/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.57

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   3   5   3   2   2  2.67 1417/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0   2   2   2   5   3  3.36 1352/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  4   0   2   4   4  3.29 1355/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.29
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  12   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14   6   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 1  0   0   2   3  4.00  146/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 5  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          15   5   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  5   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 3  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 3 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 3  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   16   3   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               16   3   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      18   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  18   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0  1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   18   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     18   1   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      18   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    18   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1092
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC          Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   SOANE, ANA MARI              Fall   2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      54
Questionnaires:  25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
        Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   3  11   5   5  3.40 1525/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   5   3   5  11  3.92 1220/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   8  15  4.48  582/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9   1   1   3   4   7  3.94 1126/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  7   1   3   3   4   6  3.65 1148/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 19  2   0   2   0   2  3.00 ****/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   4   5  14  4.20  926/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0   0  22  5.00    1/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  1   3   1  12   3  3.65 1280/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.65

        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   1   3   3  14  4.43  923/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0   1   0   3   4  13  4.33 1304/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   1   1   2   8   9  4.10 1020/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   2   1   1   5  12  4.14  995/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 14  1   1   1   2   2  3.43  983/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.43

        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   4   2   2   3   5  3.19 1293/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   1   2   6   3   4  3.44 1326/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0   3   2   4   2   5  3.25 1361/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  14   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****

        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15  9   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0  1   0   1   1   2  3.60 ****/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 3  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           20  4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20  4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 2  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    22  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22  0   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  22  0   1   0   0   0   2  3.67 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       22  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   22  2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22  0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    22  1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      22  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       22  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     22  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   10   0.00-0.99   1   A   6   Required for Majors 12   Graduate   0   Major   1
 28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   10
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   6   General   0   Under-grad   25   Non-major   24
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   2   D   1
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   0   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   13
                                          ?   1

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0401          University of Maryland                                    Page 1093
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC        Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   RILEY, SAMANTHA            Fall   2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    53
Questionnaires: 38                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                         NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  2  0  3 15 18  4.24  938/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1  6 30  4.71  293/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  2 34  4.89  157/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  11  0  0  2  6 19  4.63  370/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  14  3  0  3  6 12  4.00  773/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 19 0  1  3  2 12  4.39  534/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  8 29  4.78  185/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0 28  9  4.24 1388/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1  0  1  1  8 18  4.54  350/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  4.54

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0  0  0  1  8 23  4.69  553/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  1  5 27  4.79  825/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  1  0  1  5 26  4.67  386/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   1  0  0  0  4 26  4.87  212/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 20 2  1  2  3  3  3.36 1013/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.36

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  0  5 10 12  4.14  778/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  1  2  6 10  9  3.86 1148/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  1  1 11  6  8  3.70 1214/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.70
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  8  1  3  6  5  5  3.50  759/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  3.50

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   24 10  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 3  0  1  6  0  3.00  219/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 6  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            30  7  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  30  7  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 30  6  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 5  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 32  5  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     32  5  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 32  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  33  0  2  0  2  1  0  2.40 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  33  0  1  0  2  0  2  3.40 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        33  2  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    33  3  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  33  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     33  2  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       33  3  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        33  3  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      33  3  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	4	A	16	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0501          University of Maryland                         Page 1094
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC        Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   FAGAN, DAVID                   Fall   2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      53
Questionnaires: 25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0   3   4   8   5   5  3.20 1576/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   1   2   5   8   9  3.88 1250/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0   1   0   4   7  13  4.24  831/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0  13   1   0   3   7   1  3.58 1341/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   7   0   1   3   8   5  4.00  773/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 18   1   0   1   3   1  3.50 ****/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              1   0   3   1   6   8   6  3.54 1377/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0   3   5  13   2   2  2.80 1657/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  2.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0   2   0   8   7   2  3.37 1416/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.37


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          4   0   1   2   5  10   3  3.57 1375/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     3   0   1   0   5   8   8  4.00 1404/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4   0   3   3   5   7   3  3.19 1402/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4   0   3   1   6   5   6  3.48 1327/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  17   2   0   1   2   0  2.60 ****/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  ****


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13   0   3   0   3   3   3  3.25 1265/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13   0   3   1   2   2   4  3.25 1371/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0   3   1   2   2   4  3.25 1361/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                   13   8   0   1   1   1   1  3.50 ****/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****


          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23   1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     24   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 24   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  24   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  24   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        24   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    24   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  24   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     23   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       23   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        23   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      23   1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

Title   ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   9   0.00-0.99   4   A   10   Required for Majors   9   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   1   C   1   General   0   Under-grad   25   Non-major   25
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   1   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   10
                                            ?   0

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0601              University of Maryland                              Page 1095
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC            Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL                   Fall  2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires: 15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  5  4  5  3.80 1352/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  0  6  7  4.20  957/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  2  0  2 10  4.43  657/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   4  1  1  1  3  4  3.80 1224/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  1  4  1  2  1  2.78 1487/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9 1 0 0 2 3  4.00  895/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  3  1  4  7  4.00 1043/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 2 8 2  3.85 1140/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.85


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  537/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  862/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  3  3  6  4.08 1030/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  2  1  2  8  4.23  926/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 7 0 1 1 2  2  3.83  744/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.83


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  2  0  0  3  1  3.17 1299/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86 1148/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 1 1  5  4.57  622/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   6  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****


         Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****


         Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0  0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0701          University of Maryland                              Page 1096
Title        ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC      Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BARADWAJ, RAJAL             Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     60
Questionnaires: 47                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  5  9 14 18  3.98 1207/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  9 11 26  4.32  801/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  5 14 27  4.43  657/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  21  0  4  4  5 13  4.04 1011/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 24  1  0  5  8  8  4.00  773/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 31 0 3 4 3 6 3.75 1138/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  2  3 13 29  4.47  549/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 46  4.98  214/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 3 1 2 10 17 8 3.76 1202/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.76

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0  0  0  5  7 28  4.57  715/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9   0  0  0  5  3 30  4.66 1042/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0  0  3  6 10 19  4.18  941/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   1  0  1  6  9 21  4.35  819/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 23 2 0 6 3 4 3.47 961/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.47

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0 2 4 7 10 8 3.58 1124/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 1 3 9 5 13 3.84 1160/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 2 4 8 6 12 3.69 1218/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.69
4. Were special techniques successful                 15  21  1  1  5  1  3  3.36 ****/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 41   5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 41 0 0 0 2 0 4 4.33 ****/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 42 3 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          42   2  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 42  2  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 42 3 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 42 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 42 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   42   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               42   3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 42 0 3 0 0 1 1 2.40 ****/ 58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 41 0 2 0 1 1 2 3.17 ****/ 52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      43   1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  43   1  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 42 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/ 55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   43   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/ 42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     43   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      43   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    43   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0701                    University of Maryland                      Page 1096
Title          ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC              Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL                      Fall   2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      60
Questionnaires: 47                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades              Reasons                  Type                      Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    21        0.00-0.99   2        A    6         Required for Majors  18      Graduate      0        Major         0
  28-55     3        1.00-1.99   0        B   17
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1        C   14         General               1      Under-grad   47        Non-major    47
  84-150    1        3.00-3.49   0        D    1
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   1        F    2         Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                19
                                          ?    1
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	1	7	10	19	4.03	1159/1669	3.79	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	31	4.59	461/1666	4.28	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	33	4.71	344/1421	4.52	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	1	2	0	8	11	4.18	875/1617	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	516/1555	3.81	3.83	4.00	3.92	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	21	2	2	1	4	8	3.82	1084/1543	3.91	4.06	4.06	3.86	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	1	2	5	28	4.47	532/1647	4.28	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	22	16	4.36	1313/1668	4.33	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	5	11	14	4.30	631/1605	3.94	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	291/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	35	4.89	539/1551	4.56	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	8	24	4.49	588/1503	4.15	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	5	27	4.54	604/1506	4.26	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	24	1	1	5	1	4	3.50	939/1311	3.62	3.58	3.85	3.68	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	3	4	3	13	3.77	1029/1490	3.48	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	4	3	4	16	4.07	986/1502	3.82	3.78	4.26	4.06	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	5	3	16	4.15	986/1489	3.76	3.76	4.29	4.07	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	14	23	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1006	3.50	3.55	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	4	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 233	3.50	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.50	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.13	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.40	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 41   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   13   0.00-0.99   1   A   7   Required for Majors 18   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   13
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   2   C   10   General   2   Under-grad   41   Non-major   41
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   3   D   3
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   2   F   3   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0   responses to be significant
                                      I   0   Other   14
                                      ?   2

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0901             University of Maryland                              Page 1098
Title        ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC          Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  STARK, BETSY                    Fall   2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     50
Questionnaires: 26                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  1  2  9 13  4.36   781/1669  3.79  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  4 19  4.68   345/1666  4.28  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  4 19  4.68   380/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  12  1  0  2  2  8  4.23   821/1617  4.10  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   6  1  0  2  7  9  4.21   592/1555  3.81  3.83  4.00  3.92  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17  1  1  0  3  4  3.89  1035/1543  3.91  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  2  7 16  4.56   412/1647  4.28  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  1 14 10  4.36  1305/1668  4.33  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  1  0  0  1  5 12  4.61   288/1605  3.94  3.87  4.07  3.96  4.61

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91   170/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00     1/1551  4.56  4.62  4.66  4.55  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  1  3 19  4.78   243/1503  4.15  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  0  4 19  4.83   261/1506  4.26  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 16  1  0  1  0  5  4.14   513/1311  3.62  3.58  3.85  3.68  4.14

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  2  0  3  4  5  3.71  1062/1490  3.48  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  2  0  2  3  9  4.06   990/1502  3.82  3.78  4.26  4.06  4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  3  0  1  2  7  3.77  1186/1489  3.76  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.77
4. Were special techniques successful                   10 13  2  0  1  0  0  1.67  ****/1006  3.50  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   21  3  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00  ****/ 233  3.50  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            22  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  22  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    24  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       23  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        24  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      24  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

```
Course Section: MATH 106  0901              University of Maryland                        Page 1098
Title        ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  STARK, BETSY                        Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    50
Questionnaires: 26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                      Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     6         0.00-0.99   1      A    7      Required for Majors  7      Graduate    0      Major       0
  28-55     0         1.00-1.99   0      B   12
  56-83     0         2.00-2.99   0      C    1      General              2      Under-grad 26      Non-major  26
  84-150    0         3.00-3.49   1      D    0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   1      F    0      Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other               10
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course Section: MATH 106Y 0101          University of Maryland                                    Page 1099
Title       ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC          Baltimore County                                     JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BARADWAJ, RAJAL                    Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   3   2   4  4.11 1090/1669  4.11  4.12  4.23 4.02  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   2   4   2  3.78 1325/1666  3.78  4.16  4.19 4.11  3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   4   4  4.33  746/1421  4.33  4.30  4.24 4.11  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   1   0   1   1   4  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.09  4.15 3.99  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/1555  ****  3.83  4.00 3.92  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5   1   1   0   0   2  3.25 1344/1543  3.25  4.06  4.06 3.86  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44  583/1647  4.44  4.21  4.12 4.06  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67 4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1   0   1   1   3   0  3.40 1400/1605  3.40  3.87  4.07 3.96  3.40

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  240/1514  4.88  4.39  4.39 4.32  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75  880/1551  4.75  4.62  4.66 4.55  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   1   1   5   1  3.75 1235/1503  3.75  4.03  4.24 4.17  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  642/1506  4.50  4.16  4.26 4.17  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  7   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/1311  ****  3.58  3.85 3.68  ****

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   2   0   1   3   1  3.14 1305/1490  3.14  3.53  4.05 3.85  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   1   1   3   2  3.86 1148/1502  3.86  3.78  4.26 4.06  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   1   0   2   2   2  3.57 1249/1489  3.57  3.76  4.29 4.07  3.57
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   6   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00 3.81  ****

           Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0   2   1   0   0   1  2.25  231/ 233  2.25  3.56  4.19 4.09  2.25

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4   0   1   0   1   2   1  3.40   96/ 112  3.40  4.20  4.38 4.04  3.40
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4  1   0   0   1   2   1  4.00   68/  97  4.00  4.50  4.36 4.19  4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4   2   2   0   0   1   0  2.00   90/  92  2.00  3.50  4.22 3.79  2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     4   1   1   0   0   3   0  3.25   88/ 105  3.25  4.13  4.20 3.94  3.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 4   0   0   1   1   1   2  3.80   68/  98  3.80  4.40  3.95 3.90  3.80

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7   0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  7   0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        7   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.30  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     7   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31 4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       7   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45 4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        7   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25 4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      7   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34 4.22  ****
```

Title   ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 115  0201          University of Maryland                            Page 1100
Title       FINITE MATHEMATICS          Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   CIPCIGAN, IOANA           Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 20                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  2  0  6 11  4.20  988/1669  4.20  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  3  4 12  4.30  814/1666  4.30  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  3 16  4.75  280/1421  4.75  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  195/1617  4.78  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   7  1  0  1  4  7  4.23  575/1555  4.23  3.83  4.00  3.92  4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  11  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  390/1543  4.50  4.06  4.06  3.86  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1 18  4.85  139/1647  4.85  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   1  0  2  3  8  6  3.95 1022/1605  3.95  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.95

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76  424/1514  4.76  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  862/1551  4.76  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  3   0  2  0  1  4 10  4.18  950/1503  4.18  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  1  0  1  3 12  4.47  680/1506  4.47  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  5   9  0  1  1  0  4  4.17  501/1311  4.17  3.58  3.85  3.68  4.17

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  11   0  1  1  2  2  3  3.56 1135/1490  3.56  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  11   0  0  1  2  0  6  4.22  900/1502  4.22  3.78  4.26  4.06  4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  11   0  1  0  2  0  6  4.11 1006/1489  4.11  3.76  4.29  4.07  4.11
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   6  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  18   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  18   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  18   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  18   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

```
Course Section: MATH 115  0201              University of Maryland                        Page 1100
Title          FINITE MATHEMATICS           Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    CIPCIGAN, IOANA              Fall   2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires: 20                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades           Reasons              Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    3         0.00-0.99   0          A    7         Required for Majors  10    Graduate    0      Major        0
 28-55    2         1.00-1.99   1          B   10
 56-83    4         2.00-2.99   3          C    3         General               0    Under-grad  20     Non-major   20
 84-150   1         3.00-3.49   2          D    0
 Grad.    0         3.50-4.00   2          F    0         Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                11
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 131  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1101
Title       MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I          Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                  Fall  2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 19                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  0  0  7 11 4.61  463/1669  4.61  4.12  4.23 4.02  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  0  0  5 13 4.72  281/1666  4.72  4.16  4.19 4.11  4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  3 15 4.83  197/1421  4.83  4.30  4.24 4.11  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  3  0  0  4  4  7 4.20  863/1617  4.20  4.09  4.15 3.99  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  1  0  2  7  5 4.00  773/1555  4.00  3.83  4.00 3.92  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  1  2  2  5  7 3.88 1035/1543  3.88  4.06  4.06 3.86  3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  0  6 12 4.67  302/1647  4.67  4.21  4.12 4.06  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0 14  4 4.22 1400/1668  4.22  4.75  4.67 4.62  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  1  0  0  3  9 4.46  423/1605  4.46  3.87  4.07 3.96  4.46

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  0  0  3 14 4.82  325/1514  4.82  4.39  4.39 4.32  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  0  0  2 15 4.88  567/1551  4.88  4.62  4.66 4.55  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  2  3 12 4.59  482/1503  4.59  4.03  4.24 4.17  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  0  0  0  3 14 4.82  261/1506  4.82  4.16  4.26 4.17  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 7  0  1  1  2  5 4.22  464/1311  4.22  3.58  3.85 3.68  4.22

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  3  8 4.73  289/1490  4.73  3.53  4.05 3.85  4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  0  2  8 4.80  336/1502  4.80  3.78  4.26 4.06  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  0  0  3  8 4.73  467/1489  4.73  3.76  4.29 4.07  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   9  3  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  292/1006  4.43  3.55  4.00 3.81  4.43

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16  1  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20 3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19 4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50 4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15 4.01  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38 4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36 4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22 3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20 3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95 3.90  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33 4.30  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31 4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45 4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25 4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34 4.22  ****
```

```
Course Section: MATH 131  0101                University of Maryland                    Page 1101
Title        MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I              Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                       Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0        A    9       Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0     Major        2
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0        B    5
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99   3        C    1       General              2    Under-grad   19     Non-major   17
 84-150     0       3.00-3.49   3        D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   0        F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other               13
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 150  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1102
Title       PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC         Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL              Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   151
Questionnaires: 59                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	3	11	14	28	4.20	988/1669	4.18	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	8	15	33	4.45	634/1666	4.48	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	7	9	39	4.54	529/1421	4.55	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	24	2	3	5	9	13	3.88	1184/1617	4.12	4.09	4.15	3.99	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	16	2	5	8	7	18	3.85	980/1555	3.89	3.83	4.00	3.92	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	2	2	7	8	10	3.76	1138/1543	3.99	4.06	4.06	3.86	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	7	9	38	4.48	515/1647	4.42	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	1	0	53	4.91	713/1668	4.92	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	1	1	2	17	20	4.32	617/1605	4.20	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	8	44	4.75	457/1514	4.76	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	8	46	4.82	760/1551	4.81	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	3	15	35	4.51	556/1503	4.48	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	3	8	41	4.63	521/1506	4.65	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	1	0	13	9	19	4.07	552/1311	4.07	3.58	3.85	3.68	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	4	8	22	13	3.71	1069/1490	3.70	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	6	10	12	20	3.78	1190/1502	3.70	3.78	4.26	4.06	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	5	11	10	22	3.90	1125/1489	3.81	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	10	32	3	2	4	4	4	3.24	880/1006	3.28	3.55	4.00	3.81	3.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	5	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.50	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 105	****	4.13	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	4.40	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****

                                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   14   0.00-0.99   8   A   17   Required for Majors 16   Graduate   0   Major   0
  28-55   7   1.00-1.99   0   B   24
  56-83   0   2.00-2.99   1   C   10   General   2   Under-grad 59   Non-major   59
  84-150   0   3.00-3.49   5   D   0
  Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   33
                                         ?   0

```
Course Section: MATH 150  0201             University of Maryland                                    Page 1103
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC          Baltimore County                                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL              Fall   2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    142
Questionnaires: 69                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   3  10  19  36  4.29  864/1669  4.18  4.12  4.23 4.02  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   1   6  15  45  4.55  494/1666  4.48  4.16  4.19 4.11  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   1   7   9  51  4.62  453/1421  4.55  4.30  4.24 4.11  4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  26   0   1   5  11  25  4.43  612/1617  4.12  4.09  4.15 3.99  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  18   4   5   7  12  20  3.81 1012/1555  3.89  3.83  4.00 3.92  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 36  0   3   4   6  18  4.26  659/1543  3.99  4.06  4.06 3.86  4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   2   6  12  47  4.55  424/1647  4.42  4.21  4.12 4.06  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0   0   0   1   0  64  4.97  285/1668  4.92  4.75  4.67 4.62  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 2  1   0   4  21  25  4.35  565/1605  4.20  3.87  4.07 3.96  4.35

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   2  11  53  4.77  408/1514  4.76  4.39  4.39 4.32  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   2   4  60  4.88  594/1551  4.81  4.62  4.66 4.55  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   1   0   6  14  44  4.54  528/1503  4.48  4.03  4.24 4.17  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   1   4   8  52  4.71  421/1506  4.65  4.16  4.26 4.17  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 19  1   0   9  11  25  4.28  426/1311  4.07  3.58  3.85 3.68  4.28

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  5  11   8  10  22  3.59 1124/1490  3.70  3.53  4.05 3.85  3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  8   8  12   8  21  3.46 1319/1502  3.70  3.78  4.26 4.06  3.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  3   7  11  15  20  3.75 1191/1489  3.81  3.76  4.29 4.07  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  13  33   5   2   6   3   7  3.22  887/1006  3.28  3.55  4.00 3.81  3.22

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  51   9   2   0   4   1   2  3.11 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20 3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 55 0  1   0   7   3   3  3.50 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19 4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 55 8  0   0   4   0   2  3.67 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50 4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           55   5   1   1   3   2   2  3.33 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 55   9   0   0   2   1   2  4.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15 4.01  ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 60  2   0   1   2   1   3  3.86 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38 4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 61 4   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36 4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 62  5   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22 3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    61   3   0   1   1   1   2  3.80 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20 3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                61   4   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95 3.90  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 61   0   2   0   3   0   3  3.25 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 61   0   1   0   3   2   2  3.50 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       62   1   0   0   2   1   3  4.17 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   61   3   0   0   3   1   1  3.60 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 61   2   0   1   1   2   2  3.83 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33 4.30  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 61  0   1   1   2   2   2  3.38 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    61   1   0   0   3   2   2  3.86 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31 4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      62   1   0   0   2   2   2  4.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45 4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       61   1   0   0   3   2   2  3.86 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25 4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     61   1   0   0   3   3   1  3.71 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34 4.22  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	19	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	69	Non-major	68
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	2						

```
Course Section: MATH 150  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1104
Title       PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC         Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                 Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   135
Questionnaires:  52                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	11	18	19	4.04	1152/1669	4.18	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	12	32	4.45	620/1666	4.48	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	11	34	4.51	557/1421	4.55	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	28	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	1005/1617	4.12	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	773/1555	3.89	3.83	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	30	0	0	9	3	8	3.95	957/1543	3.99	4.06	4.06	3.86	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	11	13	25	4.24	885/1647	4.42	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	1	46	4.90	731/1668	4.92	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	7	19	7	3.94	1022/1605	4.20	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	7	41	4.76	424/1514	4.76	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	8	39	4.72	954/1551	4.81	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	17	27	4.38	742/1503	4.48	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	8	36	4.61	534/1506	4.65	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	22	4	0	4	7	12	3.85	731/1311	4.07	3.58	3.85	3.68	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	4	12	7	18	3.81	998/1490	3.70	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	13	13	14	3.86	1141/1502	3.70	3.78	4.26	4.06	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	5	10	11	14	3.78	1177/1489	3.81	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	9	22	1	4	6	6	4	3.38	819/1006	3.28	3.55	4.00	3.81	3.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	11	General	3	Under-grad	52	Non-major	52
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			

```
I     0              Other                35
?     1
```

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1105
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                Fall   2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     81
Questionnaires: 51                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  6  0  0  0 13 16 16  4.07 1131/1669  4.03  4.12  4.23 4.02  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   6  0  0  0  6 11 28  4.49  577/1666  4.21  4.16  4.19 4.11  4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  6  0  0  1  0 13 31  4.64  417/1421  4.39  4.30  4.24 4.11  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   6 24  0  0  4  5 12  4.38  662/1617  4.06  4.09  4.15 3.99  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 24  0  3  5  7  6  3.76 1054/1555  3.87  3.83  4.00 3.92  3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 27 0 1 4 4 9  4.17  759/1543  3.98  4.06  4.06 3.86  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           6  0  0  0  2  8 35  4.73  232/1647  4.32  4.21  4.12 4.06  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                 6  0  0  0  0 42  3  4.07 1498/1668  4.65  4.75  4.67 4.62  4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0 1 0 6 20 12  4.08  871/1605  3.92  3.87  4.07 3.96  4.08


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       6  0  0  0  0 13 32  4.71  505/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39 4.32  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  6  0  0  0  4 13 28  4.53 1168/1551  4.54  4.62  4.66 4.55  4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 0 5 17 23  4.40  719/1503  4.05  4.03  4.24 4.17  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    6  0  0  0  3 12 30  4.60  547/1506  4.18  4.16  4.26 4.17  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 31 3 1 4 2 4  3.21 1069/1311  3.75  3.58  3.85 3.68  3.21


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 16 11 8 4 2  2.15 1467/1490  3.33  3.53  4.05 3.85  2.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 14 8 8 4 7  2.56 1470/1502  3.49  3.78  4.26 4.06  2.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 13 6 11 2 7  2.59 1463/1489  3.58  3.76  4.29 4.07  2.59
4. Were special techniques successful                  9 36  2  3  0  0  1  2.17 ****/1006  3.38  3.55  4.00 3.81  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 48  2  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20 3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 49 0 1 0 1 0 0  2.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19 4.09  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          49  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35 4.19  ****


              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   50  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20 3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               50  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95 3.90  ****


              Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 50  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 3.81  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 50 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34 4.17  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    15       0.00-0.99     5        A   23      Required for Majors  3      Graduate      0       Major        1
 28-55     5       1.00-1.99     0        B   11
 56-83     2       2.00-2.99     2        C    5      General              1      Under-grad   51       Non-major   50
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49     3        D    1
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    11        F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other               38
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0201          University of Maryland                        Page 1106
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I       Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                 Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      61
Questionnaires: 31                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  3 11 17 4.45  662/1669 4.03 4.12 4.23 4.02 4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  7 23 4.71  306/1666 4.21 4.16 4.19 4.11 4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  1  0  6 24 4.71  344/1421 4.39 4.30 4.24 4.11 4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0 11  0  1  1  3 15 4.60  394/1617 4.06 4.09 4.15 3.99 4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  6  2  1  3  7 11 4.00  773/1555 3.87 3.83 4.00 3.92 4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 16  1  1  1  3  8 4.14  783/1543 3.98 4.06 4.06 3.86 4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  0  1  7 22 4.70  270/1647 4.32 4.21 4.12 4.06 4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0 25  5 4.17 1438/1668 4.65 4.75 4.67 4.62 4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  1  0  0  6 17 4.58  313/1605 3.92 3.87 4.07 3.96 4.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  0  3 26 4.90  206/1514 4.47 4.39 4.39 4.32 4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  0  4 25 4.86  622/1551 4.54 4.62 4.66 4.55 4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  2  4 22 4.71  323/1503 4.05 4.03 4.24 4.17 4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  0  1  5 23 4.76  353/1506 4.18 4.16 4.26 4.17 4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 18  0  0  1  2  7 4.60  219/1311 3.75 3.58 3.85 3.68 4.60

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  8  4 10  0  3 2.44 1440/1490 3.33 3.53 4.05 3.85 2.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  6  5  8  2  4 2.72 1456/1502 3.49 3.78 4.26 4.06 2.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  7  3  5  4  6 2.96 1411/1489 3.58 3.76 4.29 4.07 2.96
4. Were special techniques successful                 6 17  2  2  2  1  1 2.63  965/1006 3.38 3.55 4.00 3.81 2.63

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 30  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/ 226 **** 5.00 4.20 3.98 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29  0  0  0  1  1  0 3.50 ****/ 233 **** 3.56 4.19 4.09 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 225 **** 5.00 4.50 4.42 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          30  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 223 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 206 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA        Expected Grades      Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      6     0.00-0.99   1      A   12     Required for Majors   2   Graduate       0   Major        0
  28-55      8     1.00-1.99   0      B    8
  56-83      1     2.00-2.99   3      C    6     General               0   Under-grad    31   Non-major   31
  84-150     1     3.00-3.49   4      D    1
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00   4      F    0     Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                              responses to be significant
                                      I    0     Other                25
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1107
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I     Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    SLOWIKOWSKI, WI            Fall  2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    60
Questionnaires: 32                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	10	17	4.31	840/1669	4.03	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	20	4.47	605/1666	4.21	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	21	4.53	529/1421	4.39	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	801/1617	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	773/1555	3.87	3.83	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	857/1543	3.98	4.06	4.06	3.86	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	185/1647	4.32	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	27	5	4.16	1444/1668	4.65	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	1	10	14	4.42	473/1605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	291/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	954/1551	4.54	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	11	19	4.53	528/1503	4.05	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	23	4.59	556/1506	4.18	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	24	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	357/1311	3.75	3.58	3.85	3.68	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	9	8	7	3.40	1215/1490	3.33	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	4	8	4	12	3.76	1208/1502	3.49	3.78	4.26	4.06	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	4	4	4	14	3.76	1191/1489	3.58	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	3	15	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	920/1006	3.38	3.55	4.00	3.81	3.07
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****

```
                                     Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0401                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1108
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I             Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    SONG, YOON J                        Fall  2006                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       69
Questionnaires: 36                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  1  4 11 18  4.17 1026/1669  4.03  4.12  4.23 4.02  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1 13 21  4.50  549/1666  4.21  4.16  4.19 4.11  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2 12 22  4.56  511/1421  4.39  4.30  4.24 4.11  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  0  4  5 14  4.43  597/1617  4.06  4.09  4.15 3.99  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  14  0  2  4  6  8  4.00  773/1555  3.87  3.83  4.00 3.92  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 11 1  0  3  9 10 4.17  747/1543  3.98  4.06  4.06 3.86  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  1  9 24  4.68  292/1647  4.32  4.21  4.12 4.06  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  1 33  4.97  214/1668  4.65  4.75  4.67 4.62  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0  0  4  9 18 4.45  436/1605  3.92  3.87  4.07 3.96  4.45

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  5 31  4.86  257/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39 4.32  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  6 30  4.83  705/1551  4.54  4.62  4.66 4.55  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  1 11 23  4.56  510/1503  4.05  4.03  4.24 4.17  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  3 31  4.81  286/1506  4.18  4.16  4.26 4.17  4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0  1  4  7 13 4.28  426/1311  3.75  3.58  3.85 3.68  4.28

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  1  4  4 12 13 3.94  913/1490  3.33  3.53  4.05 3.85  3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  1  0  7 13 13 4.09  982/1502  3.49  3.78  4.26 4.06  4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  3  1  5  9 15 3.97 1072/1489  3.58  3.76  4.29 4.07  3.97
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  12  2  1  9  5  5  3.45  784/1006  3.38  3.55  4.00 3.81  3.45

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  29  4  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20 3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19 4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 0 0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50 4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           33  0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33  1  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15 4.01  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    35  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31 4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45 4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       35  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25 4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     35  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34 4.22  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     12        0.00-0.99    2         A   16        Required for Majors   5      Graduate       0       Major        1
 28-55      3        1.00-1.99    0         B   14
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99    1         C    4        General               1      Under-grad    36       Non-major   35
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49    0         D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4         F    0        Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                27
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0501            University of Maryland                              Page 1109
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                  Fall   2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     56
Questionnaires:  34                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	27	4.71	331/1669	4.03	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	23	4.68	345/1666	4.21	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	318/1421	4.39	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	347/1617	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	6	4	16		4.38	453/1555	3.87	3.83	4.00	3.92	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	516/1543	3.98	4.06	4.06	3.86	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	9	23	4.67	302/1647	4.32	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	11	20	4.65	1087/1668	4.65	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	210/1605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	240/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	30	4.88	594/1551	4.54	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	277/1503	4.05	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	313/1506	4.18	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	2	0	0	1	9	4.25	445/1311	3.75	3.58	3.85	3.68	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	356/1490	3.33	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	613/1502	3.49	3.78	4.26	4.06	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	543/1489	3.58	3.76	4.29	4.07	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	333/1006	3.38	3.55	4.00	3.81	4.36
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****

```
                                           Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0601            University of Maryland                              Page 1110
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I      Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    WILSON, MARY C              Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    57
Questionnaires: 32                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   7   4  15   6  3.63 1427/1669  4.03  4.12  4.23  4.02  3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   6   3  11  11  3.78 1320/1666  4.21  4.16  4.19  4.11  3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   4   3  14  11  4.00  969/1421  4.39  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  14   1   3   3   8   3  3.50 1372/1617  4.06  4.09  4.15  3.99  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8   1   4   4   8   7  3.67 1133/1555  3.87  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12   1   1   6   8   4  3.65 1200/1543  3.98  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   3   9   6  13  3.84 1214/1647  4.32  4.21  4.12  4.06  3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  32  5.00    1/1668  4.65  4.75  4.67  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1  3   4   3  11   4  3.36 1416/1605  3.92  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.36

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   3   6   8  15  4.09 1174/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   5   4  23  4.56 1143/1551  4.54  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   4   5   7   8   8  3.34 1378/1503  4.05  4.03  4.24  4.17  3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   4   3   5   8  12  3.66 1281/1506  4.18  4.16  4.26  4.17  3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 22  1   1   2   2   3  3.56  914/1311  3.75  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.56

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   3   5  10  10   3  3.16 1299/1490  3.33  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   2  10   5   9   5  3.16 1382/1502  3.49  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0   5   4  10   6   6  3.13 1388/1489  3.58  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.13
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  26   3   0   2   0   0  1.80 ****/1006  3.38  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      7       0.00-0.99    2       A    5        Required for Majors   3    Graduate      0      Major      1
  28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0       B   10
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99    4       C    7        General               0    Under-grad   32      Non-major  31
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49    2       D    2
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    0       F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                24
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0701              University of Maryland                              Page 1111
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I           Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C                      Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     51
Questionnaires: 25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	7	8	8	4.04	1145/1669	4.03	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	881/1666	4.21	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	2	19	4.61	466/1421	4.39	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1262/1617	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	889/1555	3.87	3.83	4.00	3.92	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	608/1543	3.98	4.06	4.06	3.86	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	666/1647	4.32	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	641/1668	4.65	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1057/1605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	489/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	825/1551	4.54	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	861/1503	4.05	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	809/1506	4.18	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	699/1311	3.75	3.58	3.85	3.68	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	5	3	7	3.45	1184/1490	3.33	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	5	5	2	7	3.33	1357/1502	3.49	3.78	4.26	4.06	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	6	3	5	6	3.55	1258/1489	3.58	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	5	17	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1006	3.38	3.55	4.00	3.81	****

```
                                       Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0801            University of Maryland                                    Page 1112
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C                      Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    53
Questionnaires:  24                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
                Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  1  1  3  9  9  4.04 1145/1669  4.03  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  2  2  5 13  4.17  975/1666  4.21  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  1  1  3  5 13  4.22  847/1421  4.39  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  15  1  0  1  2  4  4.00 1029/1617  4.06  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  13  1  0  3  3  3  3.70 1104/1555  3.87  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13  1  0  2  3  4  3.90 1019/1543  3.98  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  1  3  7 11  4.13  970/1647  4.32  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  1 20  4.95  357/1668  4.65  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  1  2  2 11  1  3.53 1348/1605  3.92  3.87  4.07  3.96  3.53

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  1  0  1  5 16  4.52  775/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  1  0  1  3 18  4.61 1111/1551  4.54  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  2  3 12  5  3.78 1220/1503  4.05  4.03  4.24  4.17  3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  2  0  5  4 12  4.04 1051/1506  4.18  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 16  1  0  0  2  2  3.80 ****/1311  3.75  3.58  3.85  3.68  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  5  3  6  2  3  2.74 1408/1490  3.33  3.53  4.05  3.85  2.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  1  3  6  4  4  3.39 1343/1502  3.49  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  1  2  3  6  6  3.78 1181/1489  3.58  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.78
4. Were special techniques successful                   6  16  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1006  3.38  3.55  4.00  3.81  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      4        0.00-0.99     1        A    7         Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55      4        1.00-1.99     0        B    5
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99     1        C    4         General              0     Under-grad  24        Non-major   24
  84-150     0        3.00-3.49     0        D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00     5        F    0         Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                             I    0         Other               15
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 151  0901              University of Maryland                        Page 1113
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ABERCROMBIE, MA                 Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     48
Questionnaires: 27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   5   5   9   6   2  2.81 1628/1669  4.03  4.12  4.23 4.02  2.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   8   0   9   9   1  2.81 1608/1666  4.21  4.16  4.19 4.11  2.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   3   3   6   8   7  3.48 1233/1421  4.39  4.30  4.24 4.11  3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  16   3   0   4   2   2  3.00 1516/1617  4.06  4.09  4.15 3.99  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 11   3   1   2   5   4  3.40 1303/1555  3.87  3.83  4.00 3.92  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 11  3   4   2   2   4  3.00 1410/1543  3.98  4.06  4.06 3.86  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   5   4   7   7   3  2.96 1534/1647  4.32  4.21  4.12 4.06  2.96
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   0   0  26  5.00    1/1668  4.65  4.75  4.67 4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  5   6  10   0   0  2.24 1578/1605  3.92  3.87  4.07 3.96  2.24

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   4   7   9   5   1  2.69 1482/1514  4.47  4.39  4.39 4.32  2.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   2   5  12   3   4  3.08 1522/1551  4.54  4.62  4.66 4.55  3.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  8   9   8   1   0  2.08 1489/1503  4.05  4.03  4.24 4.17  2.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   2  11   4   7   2   0  2.00 1490/1506  4.18  4.16  4.26 4.17  2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15  5   3   3   0   0  1.82 1282/1311  3.75  3.58  3.85 3.68  1.82

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  1   1   3   6   9  4.05  828/1490  3.33  3.53  4.05 3.85  4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  3   0   2   6   9  3.90 1117/1502  3.49  3.78  4.26 4.06  3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 1   1   7   1   9  3.84 1150/1489  3.58  3.76  4.29 4.07  3.84
4. Were special techniques successful                 7  16   1   0   2   0   1  3.00 ****/1006  3.38  3.55  4.00 3.81  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 25  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20 3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0  0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19 4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 1 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50 4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          25   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35 4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15 4.01  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      8       0.00-0.99    1       A    5        Required for Majors   6    Graduate      0     Major        0
 28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0       B    5
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99    1       C    6        General               0    Under-grad   27     Non-major   27
 84-150     0       3.00-3.49    1       D    3
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    1       F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                16
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course Section: MATH 152  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1114
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY           Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    SONG, YOON J                    Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      62
Questionnaires: 40                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
          Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  5 13 22  4.43  705/1669   4.57  4.12  4.23  4.02 4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  3 11 24  4.43  662/1666   4.61  4.16  4.19  4.11 4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  6 13 20  4.30  773/1421   4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11 4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  20  0  0  5  8  7  4.10  970/1617   4.38  4.09  4.15  3.99 4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  21  0  1  4 10  4  3.89  947/1555   3.95  3.83  4.00  3.92 3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 17 0 1  1 10 10  4.32  598/1543   4.21  4.06  4.06  3.86 4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  0  4  6 28  4.54  446/1647   4.64  4.21  4.12  4.06 4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1 39  4.97  214/1668   4.74  4.75  4.67  4.62 4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0  0  6  8 18  4.38  538/1605   4.42  3.87  4.07  3.96 4.38

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  3  6 30  4.69  537/1514   4.77  4.39  4.39  4.32 4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  3  7 29  4.67 1028/1551   4.75  4.62  4.66  4.55 4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  5 12 22  4.44  670/1503   4.57  4.03  4.24  4.17 4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1  0  1  7  4 26  4.45  718/1506   4.62  4.16  4.26  4.17 4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 28 1  0  3  4  2  3.60  890/1311   3.55  3.58  3.85  3.68 3.60

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  2 10 12 16  4.05  828/1490   4.00  3.53  4.05  3.85 4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  1  3 11  8 17  3.92 1096/1502   4.07  3.78  4.26  4.06 3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  5  1 10 14  8  3.50 1279/1489   4.05  3.76  4.29  4.07 3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  27  2  2  3  1  4  3.25  873/1006   3.53  3.55  4.00  3.81 3.25

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  32   3  0  0  1  1  3  4.40 ****/ 226   ****  5.00  4.20  3.98 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0  1  4  2  4.14 ****/ 233   ****  3.56  4.19  4.09 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 4 0 0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 225   ****  5.00  4.50  4.42 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           34   3  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 223   ****  5.00  4.35  4.19 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 34   4  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 206   ****  5.00  4.15  4.01 ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 36  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 112   ****  4.20  4.38  4.04 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 37 1 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  97   ****  4.50  4.36  4.19 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 37  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92   ****  3.50  4.22  3.79 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    37   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 105   ****  4.13  4.20  3.94 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                37   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  98   ****  4.40  3.95  3.90 ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 36   0  1  0  0  2  1  3.50 ****/  58   ****  5.00  4.22  4.00 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 37   0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/  52   ****  5.00  4.06  3.81 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       37   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  39   ****  5.00  4.39  4.30 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   37   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  40   ****  5.00  3.97  4.00 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 37   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  30   ****  5.00  4.33  4.30 ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  55   ****  5.00  4.34  4.17 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    37   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  42   ****  5.00  4.31  4.08 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      37   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  46   ****  5.00  4.45  4.26 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       37   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  33   ****  5.00  4.25  4.25 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     37   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  29   ****  5.00  4.34  4.22 ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: MATH 152  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1115
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY           Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J                      Fall   2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     56
Questionnaires: 29                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3   4   5   Mean   Rank      Mean Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  1   9  18   4.52  578/1669  4.57 4.12  4.23 4.02  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3   6  19   4.57  472/1666  4.61 4.16  4.19 4.11  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  2  2   4  20   4.38  710/1421  4.52 4.30  4.24 4.11  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  10  0  1  3   4  11   4.32  739/1617  4.38 4.09  4.15 3.99  4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11  1  1  1   7   8   4.11  698/1555  3.95 3.83  4.00 3.92  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17 1 1 4   3   4   3.75 1138/1543  4.21 4.06  4.06 3.86  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1   8  20   4.66  313/1647  4.64 4.21  4.12 4.06  4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  1   0  27   4.79  913/1668  4.74 4.75  4.67 4.62  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 3  14   6   4.13  820/1605  4.42 3.87  4.07 3.96  4.13

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  0   1  27   4.86  257/1514  4.77 4.39  4.39 4.32  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  2   3  23   4.66 1042/1551  4.75 4.62  4.66 4.55  4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  4   8  17   4.45  653/1503  4.57 4.03  4.24 4.17  4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1   6  22   4.72  394/1506  4.62 4.16  4.26 4.17  4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 22 1 0 2   1   1   3.20 ****/1311  3.55 3.58  3.85 3.68  ****

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  1  5   8  11   3.93  934/1490  4.00 3.53  4.05 3.85  3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  2  3  7   5  10   3.67 1253/1502  4.07 3.78  4.26 4.06  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  2  1  3   7  13   4.08 1020/1489  4.05 3.76  4.29 4.07  4.08
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  15  3  0  5   2   1   2.82  951/1006  3.53 3.55  4.00 3.81  2.82

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  27  0  0  0  0   1   1   4.50 ****/ 226  **** 5.00  4.20 3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0 0 0  1   1   4.50 ****/ 233  **** 3.56  4.19 4.09  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           27  0  0  0  0   0   2   5.00 ****/ 223  **** 5.00  4.35 4.19  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      7         0.00-0.99    2      A   13       Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0      Major        2
 28-55      3         1.00-1.99    0      B    8
 56-83      3         2.00-2.99    2      C    3       General              0    Under-grad   29      Non-major   27
 84-150     0         3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    2      F    1       Electives            2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other               21
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 152  0301                University of Maryland                          Page 1116
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY           Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY                        Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     48
```

```
Questionnaires: 25                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   3   2  19  4.67   389/1669   4.57  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   1   2   2  19  4.63   412/1666   4.61  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   1   0   1   6  16  4.50   557/1421   4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   6   0   0   2   5  11  4.50   496/1617   4.38  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  11   0   0   4   6   3  3.92   905/1555   3.95  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 9   0   1   2   2   9  4.36   562/1543   4.21  4.06  4.06  3.86  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   1   0   1   3  19  4.63   345/1647   4.64  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   1  18   5  4.17  1438/1668   4.74  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   1   0   0   3  16  4.65   249/1605   4.42  3.87  4.07  3.96  4.65


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   0   1   0   7  13  4.52   775/1514   4.77  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0   1   0   0   3  16  4.65  1042/1551   4.75  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0   1   0   0   5  14  4.55   510/1503   4.57  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0   1   0   0   4  15  4.60   547/1506   4.62  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 12   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   319/1311   3.55  3.58  3.85  3.68  4.43


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   2   1   2   3  11  4.05   828/1490   4.00  3.53  4.05  3.85  4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0   2   1   4  12  4.37   790/1502   4.07  3.78  4.26  4.06  4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   0   1   3   1  13  4.44   753/1489   4.05  3.76  4.29  4.07  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   9   0   1   1   1   7  4.40   307/1006   3.53  3.55  4.00  3.81  4.40

                   Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  52   ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 152  0401                 University of Maryland                                        Page 1117
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY             Baltimore County                                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                   Fall   2006                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      53
Questionnaires:  34                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor      Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                        NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3   6  25  4.65  419/1669  4.57  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3  30  4.85  142/1666  4.61  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   0   3  29  4.74  305/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  16   1   1   2   3  11  4.22  831/1617  4.38  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  15   0   3   5   3   8  3.84  988/1555  3.95  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 16  0   1   2   5  10  4.33  580/1543  4.21  4.06  4.06  3.86  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   5  28  4.79  176/1647  4.64  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   5  28  4.85  825/1668  4.74  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0   0   2   9  15  4.50  373/1605  4.42  3.87  4.07  3.96  4.50

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   0   0   0  33  4.88  223/1514  4.77  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   4  30  4.88  567/1551  4.75  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   2   6  25  4.62  451/1503  4.57  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   0   1   2  29  4.65  496/1506  4.62  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23  3  1   1   0   6  3.45  967/1311  3.55  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.45

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   3   4   5   8  11  3.65 1097/1490  4.00  3.53  4.05  3.85  3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   2   1   6  10  12  3.94 1085/1502  4.07  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0   2   0   7  10  12  3.97 1072/1489  4.05  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.97
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  22   1   0   4   0   4  3.67  694/1006  3.53  3.55  4.00  3.81  3.67

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29   1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 1  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.42  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           31   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.01  ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.04  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 1  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.19  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    31   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  3.94  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                31   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.90  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 32   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       31   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  4.30  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   31   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 32   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  4.30  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    30   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      29   1   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.26  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       29   1   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     29   1   0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  4.22  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

```
Course Section: MATH 152  0501          University of Maryland                        Page 1118
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY        Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  KAPOOR, JAGMOHA              Fall  2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires: 20                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
        Questions                         NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  0  5 14  4.60  478/1669  4.57  4.12  4.23 4.02 4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  2  0 17  4.60  439/1666  4.61  4.16  4.19 4.11 4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  2 16  4.70  356/1421  4.52  4.30  4.24 4.11 4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  207/1617  4.38  4.09  4.15 3.99 4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  2  3  1  7  4.00  773/1555  3.95  3.83  4.00 3.92 4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 0 1 1 2  6  4.30  608/1543  4.21  4.06  4.06 3.86 4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  2  0  2 15  4.58  401/1647  4.64  4.21  4.12 4.06 4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  731/1668  4.74  4.75  4.67 4.62 4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 1 0 1 2 10  4.43  473/1605  4.42  3.87  4.07 3.96 4.43

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  189/1514  4.77  4.39  4.39 4.32 4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  512/1551  4.75  4.62  4.66 4.55 4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  0  1 17  4.79  243/1503  4.57  4.03  4.24 4.17 4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  1  1 17  4.70  433/1506  4.62  4.16  4.26 4.17 4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 9 4 1 1 2  2  2.70 1205/1311  3.55  3.58  3.85 3.68 2.70

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  2  3  9  4.33  622/1490  4.00  3.53  4.05 3.85 4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  1  0  6  9  4.44  717/1502  4.07  3.78  4.26 4.06 4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 1 1 3 10  4.25  920/1489  4.05  3.76  4.29 4.07 4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  13  1  0  2  0  0  2.33 ****/1006  3.53  3.55  4.00 3.81 ****

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  18   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20 3.98 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19 4.09 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50 4.42 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35 4.19 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15 4.01 ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38 4.04 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 1 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36 4.19 ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.00 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  4.06  3.81 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.30 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 4.00 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33 4.30 ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34 4.17 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31 4.08 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45 4.26 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25 4.25 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34 4.22 ****
```

```
Course Section: MATH 152  0501              University of Maryland                    Page 1118
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY          Baltimore County                       JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 20                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27   3        0.00-0.99   0         A   3         Required for Majors  1    Graduate    1       Major       0
28-55   1        1.00-1.99   0         B   8                                                       
56-83   0        2.00-2.99   2         C   1         General              2    Under-grad  19      Non-major   20
84-150  3        3.00-3.49   2         D   1
Grad.   1        3.50-4.00   0         F   1         Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   1                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0         Other                11
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course Section: MATH 152H 0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1119
Title        CALC/ANALY GEOM II-HON           Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  RATHINAM, MURUH                    Fall  2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       9
Questionnaires:   7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   511/1669  4.57  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43   662/1666  4.43  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1421  5.00  4.30  4.24  4.11  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   424/1617  4.57  4.09  4.15  3.99  4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43   490/1543  4.43  4.06  4.06  3.86  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57   401/1647  4.57  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0  0  0  1  4  1  4.00   918/1605  4.00  3.87  4.07  3.96  4.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1514  5.00  4.39  4.39  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   954/1551  4.71  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43   686/1503  4.43  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   225/1506  4.86  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1311  ****  3.58  3.85  3.68  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1   0  2  1  2  0  1  2.50  1431/1490  2.50  3.53  4.05  3.85  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1   0  0  2  2  0  2  3.33  1357/1502  3.33  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1   0  1  1  1  1  2  3.33  1341/1489  3.33  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.33

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 155  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1120
Title       ELEMENTARY CALCULUS          Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  LYNN, YEN-MOW               Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     50
Questionnaires: 20                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	7	6	2	0	2.32	1661/1669	2.98	4.12	4.23	4.02	2.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	7	2	0	2.30	1652/1666	2.83	4.16	4.19	4.11	2.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	7	6	4	1	2.75	1390/1421	3.25	4.30	4.24	4.11	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	4	3	3	2	0	2.25	1606/1617	3.08	4.09	4.15	3.99	2.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	2	4	4	0	2.83	1478/1555	3.28	3.83	4.00	3.92	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1520/1543	2.92	4.06	4.06	3.86	2.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	4	5	4	3.15	1512/1647	3.64	4.21	4.12	4.06	3.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	12	2	3	0	0	1.47	1601/1605	2.28	3.87	4.07	3.96	1.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	4	1	6	5	3.32	1422/1514	3.65	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	3	5	2	6	3.26	1515/1551	3.79	4.62	4.66	4.55	3.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	11	4	4	0	0	1.63	1500/1503	2.67	4.03	4.24	4.17	1.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	4	3	3	0	2.00	1490/1506	2.87	4.16	4.26	4.17	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1253/1311	2.83	3.58	3.85	3.68	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	3	4	0	0	1.79	1482/1490	2.60	3.53	4.05	3.85	1.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	5	2	3	1	1	2.25	1489/1502	2.99	3.78	4.26	4.06	2.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	7	1	3	1	0	1.83	1486/1489	2.49	3.76	4.29	4.07	1.83
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.50	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.13	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.40	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	4.25	****

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	0	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

```
Course Section: MATH 155  0201             University of Maryland                          Page 1121
Title       ELEMENTARY CALCULUS              Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    STAFF                            Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     51
Questionnaires:  27                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3  0  0  1  5  6 12  4.21  976/1669  2.98  4.12  4.23  4.02  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  1  1  4  5 14  4.20  957/1666  2.83  4.16  4.19  4.11  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3  0  0  2  4  8 10  4.08  939/1421  3.25  4.30  4.24  4.11  4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3  6  1  3  3  5  6  3.67 1301/1617  3.08  4.09  4.15  3.99  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  5  3  2  1  6  7  3.63 1155/1555  3.28  3.83  4.00  3.92  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  8  3  3  2  4  4  3.19 1365/1543  2.92  4.06  4.06  3.86  3.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3  0  0  0  3  8 13  4.42  634/1647  3.64  4.21  4.12  4.06  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3  0  0  0  0  4 20  4.83  844/1668  4.94  4.75  4.67  4.62  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11  1  1  0  1  9  4  4.00  918/1605  2.28  3.87  4.07  3.96  4.00


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  0  0  1  8 14  4.57  727/1514  3.65  4.39  4.39  4.32  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4  0  1  0  2  3 17  4.52 1176/1551  3.79  4.62  4.66  4.55  4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  3  8 11  4.36  765/1503  2.67  4.03  4.24  4.17  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  0  0  1  2  8 12  4.35  828/1506  2.87  4.16  4.26  4.17  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 12  1  3  1  0  4  3.33 1027/1311  2.83  3.58  3.85  3.68  3.33


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  2  1  6  9  4.22  718/1490  2.60  3.53  4.05  3.85  4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  1  0  7  5  5  3.72 1225/1502  2.99  3.78  4.26  4.06  3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11  0  0  1  5  5  5  3.88 1137/1489  2.49  3.76  4.29  4.07  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                 11  7  1  1  1  3  3  3.67  694/1006  3.67  3.55  4.00  3.81  3.67


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  3.98  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.09  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  26  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  3.81  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.17  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    1       A    2      Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0     Major       0
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    1       B    5                                Under-grad   27     Non-major  27
 56-83      7       2.00-2.99    5       C   13      General              0
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49    4       D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    0       F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other               17
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 155  0301              University of Maryland                          Page 1122
Title       ELEMENTARY CALCULUS              Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  LYNN, YEN-MOW                   Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     56
Questionnaires:  15                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  3  5  3  3  0  2.43 1655/1669  2.98 4.12  4.23 4.02  2.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  7  0  7  0  0  2.00 1660/1666  2.83 4.16  4.19 4.11  2.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  3  1  5  4  1  2.93 1377/1421  3.25 4.30  4.24 4.11  2.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   8  0  1  2  3  0  3.33 1448/1617  3.08 4.09  4.15 3.99  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   3  1  2  2  4  2  3.36 1316/1555  3.28 3.83  4.00 3.92  3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  1  1  1  4  0  3.14 1379/1543  2.92 4.06  4.06 3.86  3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  2  2  3  3  4  3.36 1464/1647  3.64 4.21  4.12 4.06  3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1668  4.94 4.75  4.67 4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  7  4  0  0  0  1.36 1603/1605  2.28 3.87  4.07 3.96  1.36

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  2  1  5  2  2  3.08 1450/1514  3.65 4.39  4.39 4.32  3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  1  1  3  4  3  3.58 1485/1551  3.79 4.62  4.66 4.55  3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  5  2  3  1  0  2.00 1492/1503  2.67 4.03  4.24 4.17  2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  5  3  2  0  2  2.25 1482/1506  2.87 4.16  4.26 4.17  2.25

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  3  1  0  1  0  1.80 1482/1490  2.60 3.53  4.05 3.85  1.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  1  1  1  1  1  3.00 1395/1502  2.99 3.78  4.26 4.06  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  2  1  1  0  0  1.75 1487/1489  2.49 3.76  4.29 4.07  1.75

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  **** 3.56  4.19 4.09  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 223  **** 5.00  4.35 4.19  ****


                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1     0.00-0.99   0        A    1      Required for Majors  3      Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55     3     1.00-1.99   0        B    2
  56-83     1     2.00-2.99   1        C    6      General              0      Under-grad  15      Non-major  15
  84-150    0     3.00-3.49   1        D    0
  Grad.     0     3.50-4.00   2        F    1      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                9
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course Section: MATH 215  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1123
Title       FINITE MATH FOR INFO S       Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  LO, JAMES T                  Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      54
Questionnaires: 22                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                         NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   0   7   8   5   0  2.90 1617/1669  2.90  4.12  4.23  4.34  2.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0   1   7   5   3   3  3.00 1578/1666  3.00  4.16  4.19  4.29  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0   3   4   4   3   5  3.16 1336/1421  3.16  4.30  4.24  4.35  3.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   9   2   2   3   1   2  2.90 1552/1617  2.90  4.09  4.15  4.24  2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   2   3   2   3   5   4  3.29 1340/1555  3.29  3.83  4.00  3.96  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4  8   1   1   3   3   2  3.40 1303/1543  3.40  4.06  4.06  4.10  3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0   0   4   3   5   7  3.79 1260/1647  3.79  4.21  4.12  4.19  3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   1   0   0   0   0  18  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0   4   4   5   2   0  2.33 1573/1605  2.33  3.87  4.07  4.15  2.33

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   3   3   5   4   3  3.06 1453/1514  3.06  4.39  4.39  4.39  3.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   0   1   2   8   7  4.17 1371/1551  4.17  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0   9   1   0   4   3  2.47 1474/1503  2.47  4.03  4.24  4.29  2.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0   7   3   2   4   2  2.50 1458/1506  2.50  4.16  4.26  4.33  2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 16  1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/1311  ****  3.58  3.85  3.96  ****

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0   3   3   1   1   1  2.33 1456/1490  2.33  3.53  4.05  4.11  2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0   3   2   3   0   0  2.00 1495/1502  2.00  3.78  4.26  4.31  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0   1   4   2   2   0  2.56 1465/1489  2.56  3.76  4.29  4.36  2.56
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  8   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00  3.99  ****

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   19  1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  4.42  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0  1   2   0   0   0  1.67 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.74  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            20  0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.71  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.59  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20  1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  97  ****  4.50  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  92  ****  3.50  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     20  1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 20  0   0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  4.20  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  20  0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  20  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        20  1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    20  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  20  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33  5.00  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     20  1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       20  1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        20  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      20  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 221  0101                University of Maryland                                  Page 1124
Title          INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                                      JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    LO, JAMES T                     Fall   2006                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      46
Questionnaires:  25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  3  2  8 11  4.13 1077/1669  4.16  4.12  4.23 4.34  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  4  8 12  4.33  777/1666  4.17  4.16  4.19 4.29  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  3  7 13  4.33  746/1421  4.21  4.30  4.24 4.35  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  8  0  0  2  6  8  4.38  673/1617  4.28  4.09  4.15 4.24  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 6  1  0  4  6  7  4.00  773/1555  4.17  3.83  4.00 3.96  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8 0 1 1 3 11 4.50  390/1543  4.35  4.06  4.06 4.10  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  1  0  3  2 17  4.48  532/1647  4.29  4.21  4.12 4.19  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 24  5.00    1/1668  4.77  4.75  4.67 4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 5 6 7  4.11  840/1605  3.80  3.87  4.07 4.15  4.11

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  8 16  4.67  584/1514  4.41  4.39  4.39 4.39  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  256/1551  4.67  4.62  4.66 4.72  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0  2  1 10 10  4.22  914/1503  4.00  4.03  4.24 4.29  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  4  2  3 14  4.04 1051/1506  4.04  4.16  4.26 4.33  4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 19 0 0 0 1 4  4.80 ****/1311  4.04  3.58  3.85 3.96  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 0 1 1 2  3.60 ****/1490  3.45  3.53  4.05 4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 2 0 1 1 1  2.80 ****/1502  3.72  3.78  4.26 4.31  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 1 1 0 0 3  3.60 ****/1489  3.66  3.76  4.29 4.36  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  20  3  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1006  3.80  3.55  4.00 3.99  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19 4.36  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 5.00  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34 4.67  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45 5.00  ****

                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1       0.00-0.99   1      A   11      Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0       Major        4
28-55      5       1.00-1.99   0      B   11
56-83      6       2.00-2.99   1      C    2      General              0      Under-grad   25       Non-major   21
84-150     3       3.00-3.49  10      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   7      F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               24
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 221  0201                University of Maryland                                    Page 1125
Title          INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR         Baltimore County                                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    SHEN, JINGLAI                  Fall   2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires: 16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  1  5  9  4.38   769/1669   4.16  4.12   4.23 4.34  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  2  6  8  4.38   727/1666   4.17  4.16   4.19 4.29  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  2  5  9  4.44   645/1421   4.21  4.30   4.24 4.35  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6   0  0  1  4  5  4.40   641/1617   4.28  4.09   4.15 4.24  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   0  0  1  4  8  4.54   316/1555   4.17  3.83   4.00 3.96  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  0  1  3  9  4.62   290/1543   4.35  4.06   4.06 4.10  4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  1  0  5 10  4.50   481/1647   4.29  4.21   4.12 4.19  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0  0  0  0 15  5.00     1/1668   4.77  4.75   4.67 4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0  1  3  5  1  3.60  1312/1605   3.80  3.87   4.07 4.15  3.60

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  6 10  4.63   647/1514   4.41  4.39   4.39 4.39  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  1  5 10  4.56  1143/1551   4.67  4.62   4.66 4.72  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  2  2  4  8  4.13   996/1503   4.00  4.03   4.24 4.29  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1   1  0  2  2 10  4.33   838/1506   4.04  4.16   4.26 4.33  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  ****/1311   4.04  3.58   3.85 3.96  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   0  1  5  0  1  3.14  1305/1490   3.45  3.53   4.05 4.11  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   0  2  1  2  2  3.57  1285/1502   3.72  3.78   4.26 4.31  3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0  1  4  0  2  3.43  1310/1489   3.66  3.76   4.29 4.36  3.43

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 112   ****  4.20   4.38 4.59  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2       0.00-0.99   1     A   7      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major        2
  28-55     2       1.00-1.99   0     B   9
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99   1     C   0      General               0     Under-grad   16      Non-major   14
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49   1     D   0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   3     F   0      Electives             4     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other                12
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 221  0301                University of Maryland                            Page 1126
Title        INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR            Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  GOBBERT, MATTHI                   Fall   2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      42
```
```
Questionnaires:  28                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	9	13	4.15	1052/1669	4.16	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	11	8	3.93	1206/1666	4.17	4.16	4.19	4.29	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	8	11	4.04	957/1421	4.21	4.30	4.24	4.35	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	790/1617	4.28	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	9	11	4.16	644/1555	4.17	3.83	4.00	3.96	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	6	5	9	4.00	895/1543	4.35	4.06	4.06	4.10	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	12	9	4.07	1007/1647	4.29	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	570/1668	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.59	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	7	12	5	3.80	1172/1605	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	739/1514	4.41	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	1119/1551	4.67	4.62	4.66	4.72	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	8	7	10	3.89	1176/1503	4.00	4.03	4.24	4.29	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	3	7	12	3.96	1111/1506	4.04	4.16	4.26	4.33	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	567/1311	4.04	3.58	3.85	3.96	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1154/1490	3.45	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1283/1502	3.72	3.78	4.26	4.31	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1318/1489	3.66	3.76	4.29	4.36	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	643/1006	3.80	3.55	4.00	3.99	3.80
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****

```
                                      Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: MATH 221  0401                University of Maryland                              Page 1127
Title        INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR              Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  POTRA, FLORIAN                        Fall  2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      50
Questionnaires: 23                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  1  4  8  9  4.00 1173/1669  4.16  4.12  4.23  4.34  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  0  5  8  9  4.04 1071/1666  4.17  4.16  4.19  4.29  4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  1  5  9  8  4.04  954/1421  4.21  4.30  4.24  4.35  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  7  0  0  4  7  5  4.06  993/1617  4.28  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  0  2  4  6  8  4.00  773/1555  4.17  3.83  4.00  3.96  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  0  0  3  5  7  4.27  649/1543  4.35  4.06  4.06  4.10  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  2  2 10  8  4.09  997/1647  4.29  4.21  4.12  4.19  4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0 19  3  4.14 1457/1668  4.77  4.75  4.67  4.59  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  1  0  5  8  3  3.71 1249/1605  3.80  3.87  4.07  4.15  3.71

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0 10  8  5  3.78 1313/1514  4.41  4.39  4.39  4.39  3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  3  4 16  4.57 1143/1551  4.67  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  1  8  5  8  3.78 1220/1503  4.00  4.03  4.24  4.29  3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  1  6  8  7  3.83 1214/1506  4.04  4.16  4.26  4.33  3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 16 2  0  2  1  0  2.40 ****/1311  4.04  3.58  3.85  3.96  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  3  3  1  3.71 1062/1490  3.45  3.53  4.05  4.11  3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00 1013/1502  3.72  3.78  4.26  4.31  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0  0  1  4  2  4.14  986/1489  3.66  3.76  4.29  4.36  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  16  4  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/1006  3.80  3.55  4.00  3.99  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.36  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06  5.00  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    22  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  5.00  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99   3       A   7        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major       2
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99   0       B   8                                                       
 56-83      5       2.00-2.99   2       C   4        General              0     Under-grad  23      Non-major  21
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49   4       D   0                                                       
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1       F   0        Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               20
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course Section: MATH 225  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1128
Title      INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ROSTAMIAN, ROUB               Fall   2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    51
Questionnaires:  27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1 10 16  4.56   534/1669   4.30  4.12  4.23  4.34  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  3  9 14  4.33   777/1666   4.13  4.16  4.19  4.29  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  4  4 18  4.41   683/1421   4.16  4.30  4.24  4.35  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  15  0  1  4  1  6  4.00  1029/1617   3.72  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  13  0  2  0  8  3  3.92   905/1555   3.79  3.83  4.00  3.96  3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 13  0  0  0  7  6  4.46   440/1543   4.03  4.06  4.06  4.10  4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  2  1  5 18  4.50   481/1647   4.20  4.21  4.12  4.19  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  0 25  5.00     1/1668   4.87  4.75  4.67  4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  0  2 16  6  4.04   891/1605   3.70  3.87  4.07  4.15  4.04


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  2  8 17  4.56   739/1514   4.54  4.39  4.39  4.39  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  4 22  4.78   843/1551   4.75  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  2  9 15  4.41   719/1503   4.09  4.03  4.24  4.29  4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   1  0  0  2  6 18  4.62   534/1506   4.07  4.16  4.26  4.33  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  7  2  3  9  4  2  3.05  1109/1311   3.16  3.58  3.85  3.96  3.05


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  2  1  4  2  3.67  1088/1490   3.76  3.53  4.05  4.11  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44   705/1502   4.58  3.78  4.26  4.31  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0  0  0  4  2  1  3.57  1249/1489   3.79  3.76  4.29  4.36  3.57


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    1      A   12        Required for Majors   0     Graduate     1      Major        2
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0      B    7
 56-83      5       2.00-2.99    3      C    5        General               1     Under-grad  26      Non-major   25
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49    5      D    0
 Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    6      F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                24
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course Section: MATH 225  0201              University of Maryland                                Page 1129
Title         INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT         Baltimore County                                     JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BELL, JOHN D                   Fall   2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 20                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  2  5 12  1  3.60 1437/1669  4.30  4.12  4.23 4.34  3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  4  6  7  3  3.45 1489/1666  4.13  4.16  4.19 4.29  3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1  1  7  6  5  3.65 1170/1421  4.16  4.30  4.24 4.35  3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   1  1  7  9  1  3.42 1414/1617  3.72  4.09  4.15 4.24  3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   0  0  5  9  4  3.94  872/1555  3.79  3.83  4.00 3.96  3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  1  1  2  1  5  3.80 1101/1543  4.03  4.06  4.06 4.10  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  1  5 12  2  3.75 1275/1647  4.20  4.21  4.12 4.19  3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  8 12  4.60 1125/1668  4.87  4.75  4.67 4.59  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  2  2 12  2  1  2.89 1527/1605  3.70  3.87  4.07 4.15  2.89


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   1  0  2  7  9  4.21 1106/1514  4.54  4.39  4.39 4.39  4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0  0  0  8 11  4.58 1135/1551  4.75  4.62  4.66 4.72  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0  4  7  5  2  3.28 1390/1503  4.09  4.03  4.24 4.29  3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   4  1  7  5  2  3.00 1403/1506  4.07  4.16  4.26 4.33  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 17  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/1311  3.16  3.58  3.85 3.96  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/1490  3.76  3.53  4.05 4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0   1  1  0  2  0  2.75 ****/1502  4.58  3.78  4.26 4.31  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/1489  3.79  3.76  4.29 4.36  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    1       A    2       Required for Majors  2    Graduate      0      Major       2
 28-55      3      1.00-1.99    0       B    9
 56-83      5      2.00-2.99    3       C    7       General              1    Under-grad   20      Non-major  18
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49    4       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5       F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    1                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               16
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 225  0301              University of Maryland                           Page 1130
Title        INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MINKOFF, SUSAN                    Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      38
Questionnaires:  28                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  7 21  4.75  269/1669  4.30  4.12  4.23  4.34  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  2  7 19  4.61  439/1666  4.13  4.16  4.19  4.29  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3 10 15  4.43  657/1421  4.16  4.30  4.24  4.35  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  1  2  7 11  7  3.75 1251/1617  3.72  4.09  4.15  4.24  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10  1  4  2  7  4  3.50 1227/1555  3.79  3.83  4.00  3.96  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0  4  3  9  7  3.83 1084/1543  4.03  4.06  4.06  4.10  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  1  2 11 14  4.36  728/1647  4.20  4.21  4.12  4.19  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0 28  5.00    1/1668  4.87  4.75  4.67  4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  3 16  7  4.15  800/1605  3.70  3.87  4.07  4.15  4.15

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  1  2 24  4.85  274/1514  4.54  4.39  4.39  4.39  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  1  1 25  4.89  567/1551  4.75  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  9 17  4.59  473/1503  4.09  4.03  4.24  4.29  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  1  0  8 18  4.59  556/1506  4.07  4.16  4.26  4.33  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 9  2  4  3  5  4  3.28 1051/1311  3.16  3.58  3.85  3.96  3.28

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0  0  1  2  1  3  3.86  979/1490  3.76  3.53  4.05  4.11  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  438/1502  4.58  3.78  4.26  4.31  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0  1  0  0  3  3  4.00 1038/1489  3.79  3.76  4.29  4.36  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   21  5  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00  3.99  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.36  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                     Type                        Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2        0.00-0.99    1        A    9        Required for Majors   0        Graduate       0        Major       10
28-55     8        1.00-1.99    0        B   15
56-83    10        2.00-2.99    3        C    4        General               0        Under-grad    28        Non-major   18
84-150    2        3.00-3.49    4        D    0
Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   13        F    0        Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                27
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 251  0101          University of Maryland                      Page 1131
Title        MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS      Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SEIDMAN, THOMAS                  Fall  2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      64
Questionnaires:  21                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
          Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean   Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  2  4  5  9  3.90 1288/1669  3.60  4.12  4.23  4.34  3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  1  5  1  9  5  3.57 1442/1666  3.39  4.16  4.19  4.29  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  4  5 11  4.24  831/1421  3.60  4.30  4.24  4.35  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   7  0  0  4  4  6  4.14  922/1617  3.70  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  3  5  8  4.31  508/1555  3.59  3.83  4.00  3.96  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  0  1  1  3  6  4.27  638/1543  3.77  4.06  4.06  4.10  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  5  6  9  4.10  997/1647  4.03  4.21  4.12  4.19  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  901/1668  4.70  4.75  4.67  4.59  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 1 4 4 5 3 3.29 1443/1605  3.02  3.87  4.07  4.15  3.29


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  2  1  4  6  7  3.75 1324/1514  3.53  4.39  4.39  4.39  3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  1  0  3  1 16  4.48 1216/1551  4.52  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  3  2  6  5  5  3.33 1380/1503  3.21  4.03  4.24  4.29  3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  4  1  5  5  6  3.38 1351/1506  3.28  4.16  4.26  4.33  3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 15 3 0 1 1 1 2.50 1227/1311  2.87  3.58  3.85  3.96  2.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/1490 ****  3.53  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 1 0 2 1 0 2.75 ****/1502 ****  3.78  4.26  4.31  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/1489 ****  3.76  4.29  4.36  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 16   3  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/1006 ****  3.55  4.00  3.99  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  58 ****  5.00  4.22  4.20  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                        Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0         0.00-0.99    1       A    5       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0        Major         2
  28-55     10         1.00-1.99    0       B    8
  56-83      1         2.00-2.99    6       C    3       General              0      Under-grad   21        Non-major    19
  84-150     3         3.00-3.49    2       D    0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    6       F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    1                                         responses to be significant
                                            I    0       Other               19
                                            ?    2
```

```
Course Section: MATH 251  0201            University of Maryland                        Page 1132
Title       MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS         Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ROSTAMIAN, ROUB                 Fall  2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    52
Questionnaires: 25                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
                                                                                                        -----
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0    0    1    0    3    7   14   4.32   828/1669   3.60   4.12   4.23   4.34   4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1    0    0    3    3    4   14   4.21   949/1666   3.39   4.16   4.19   4.29   4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0    0    2    0    4    8   11   4.04   954/1421   3.60   4.30   4.24   4.35   4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   14    0    0    2    2    7   4.45   568/1617   3.70   4.09   4.15   4.24   4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   10    1    1    3    6    4   3.73  1079/1555   3.59   3.83   4.00   3.96   3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13    0    0    1    3    8   4.58   316/1543   3.77   4.06   4.06   4.10   4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0    0    0    1    4    2   18   4.48   515/1647   4.03   4.21   4.12   4.19   4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0    1    0    0    0    0   24   5.00     1/1668   4.70   4.75   4.67   4.59   5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0    1    0    6   12    5   3.83  1148/1605   3.02   3.87   4.07   4.15   3.83

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1    0    1    0    2    8   13   4.33  1022/1514   3.53   4.39   4.39   4.39   4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1    0    0    0    0    4   20   4.83   705/1551   4.52   4.62   4.66   4.72   4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1    0    1    1    5    6   11   4.04  1045/1503   3.21   4.03   4.24   4.29   4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1    0    0    3    4    5   12   4.08  1033/1506   3.28   4.16   4.26   4.33   4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   6    1    1    2    4    9   4.12   531/1311   2.87   3.58   3.85   3.96   4.12

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21   0    0    0    2    0    2   4.00  ****/1490   ****   3.53   4.05   4.11   ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21   0    0    0    2    0    2   4.00  ****/1502   ****   3.78   4.26   4.31   ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21  0    0    0    1    1    2   4.25  ****/1489   ****   3.76   4.29   4.36   ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   20   4    0    0    0    0    1   5.00  ****/1006   ****   3.55   4.00   3.99   ****

                              Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	4						

```
Course Section: MATH 251  0301           University of Maryland                              Page 1133
Title      MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS         Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   MUSCEDERE, MICH                  Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    55
Questionnaires: 21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  6  4  7  1  3  2.57 1639/1669  3.60  4.12  4.23  4.34  2.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  7  4  6  3  1  2.38 1643/1666  3.39  4.16  4.19  4.29  2.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  6  5  5  3  2  2.52 1405/1421  3.60  4.30  4.24  4.35  2.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  7  4  4  2  3  1  2.50 1591/1617  3.70  4.09  4.15  4.24  2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  5  3  0  3  3  2.71 1497/1555  3.59  3.83  4.00  3.96  2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8  5  2  3  1  2  2.46 1518/1543  3.77  4.06  4.06  4.10  2.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  4  1  3  6  7  3.52 1385/1647  4.03  4.21  4.12  4.19  3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 15  6  4.29 1364/1668  4.70  4.75  4.67  4.59  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 6  5  5  0  0  1.94 1592/1605  3.02  3.87  4.07  4.15  1.94


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  7  3  4  5  1  2.50 1486/1514  3.53  4.39  4.39  4.39  2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  1  1  1  6 11  4.25 1338/1551  4.52  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  8  2  7  3  0  2.25 1481/1503  3.21  4.03  4.24  4.29  2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  8  2  5  2  2  2.37 1473/1506  3.28  4.16  4.26  4.33  2.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  8  4  4  2  0  2.00 1269/1311  2.87  3.58  3.85  3.96  2.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  3  0  1  0  1  2.20 ****/1490  ****  3.53  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  4  0  1  0  0  1.40 ****/1502  ****  3.78  4.26  4.31  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1  2  2  0  0  2.20 ****/1489  ****  3.76  4.29  4.36  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  16  3  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00  3.99  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 1 0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.36  ****


                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0       A   3        Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55     7       1.00-1.99   0       B   7
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99   0       C   5        General              2    Under-grad  21      Non-major   21
  84-150    1       3.00-3.49   6       D   1
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   4       F   0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               14
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course Section: MATH 251H 0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1134
Title                                           Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ZWECK, JOHN                      Fall   2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies          Instructor      Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5   Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   3  13   4.81   199/1669   4.81  4.12   4.23  4.34  4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2   4   9   4.47   605/1666   4.47  4.16   4.19  4.29  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   3  11   4.56   502/1421   4.56  4.30   4.24  4.35  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   0   1   2   4   4   4.00  1029/1617   4.00  4.09   4.15  4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   1   0   0   4   5   6   4.13   676/1555   4.13  3.83   4.00  3.96  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   7   0   0   1   3   5   4.44   465/1543   4.44  4.06   4.06  4.10  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   3   8   5   4.13   977/1647   4.13  4.21   4.12  4.19  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  16   5.00     1/1668   5.00  4.75   4.67  4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   0   0   0   1   5  10   4.56   328/1605   4.56  3.87   4.07  4.15  4.56

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   1  14   4.81   342/1514   4.81  4.39   4.39  4.39  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  16   5.00     1/1551   5.00  4.62   4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   1   0   8   7   4.31   823/1503   4.31  4.03   4.24  4.29  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   3  13   4.81   273/1506   4.81  4.16   4.26  4.33  4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1   7   2   0   3   2   1   3.00  1115/1311   3.00  3.58   3.85  3.96  3.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4   0   1   1   2   3   5   3.83   988/1490   3.83  3.53   4.05  4.11  3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4   0   0   1   1   3   7   4.33   818/1502   4.33  3.78   4.26  4.31  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6   0   0   0   4   2   4   4.00  1038/1489   4.00  3.76   4.29  4.36  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   9   0   0   1   2   0   3.67  ****/1006   ****  3.55   4.00  3.99  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   1   0   1   0   0   0   2.00  ****/ 226   ****  5.00   4.20  4.42  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  15   0   0   1   0   0   0   2.00  ****/ 233   ****  3.56   4.19  4.36  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3        0.00-0.99   0          A   7        Required for Majors  0        Graduate      0        Major        8
28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0          B   7                                      Under-grad   16
56-83     5        2.00-2.99   0          C   2        General              0                               Non-major    8
84-150    0        3.00-3.49   2          D   0
Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   5          F   0        Electives            1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other               15
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 301  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1135
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I         Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ARMSTRONG, THOM               Fall  2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   2   6   6  4.13 1064/1669  4.04  4.12  4.23  4.28  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   4   7   4  4.00 1094/1666  4.14  4.16  4.19  4.20  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   5   8  4.33  746/1421  4.32  4.30  4.24  4.25  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   0   2   0   4   4  4.00 1029/1617  4.01  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   0   1   2   4   3  3.90  939/1555  3.43  3.83  4.00  4.03  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  1  0  4  7  4.42  503/1543  4.06  4.06  4.06  4.14  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   3   4   5   3  3.53 1381/1647  3.57  4.21  4.12  4.14  3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  14  4.93  499/1668  4.95  4.75  4.67  4.68  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  1  5  6  3  3.73 1225/1605  3.97  3.87  4.07  4.09  3.73

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   1   6   7  4.27 1076/1514  4.48  4.39  4.39  4.46  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   0   1  13  4.73  917/1551  4.86  4.62  4.66  4.70  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   4   5   5   1  3.20 1401/1503  3.75  4.03  4.24  4.28  3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   2   6   4   2  3.27 1374/1506  3.94  4.16  4.26  4.30  3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9  1  1  0  0  4  3.83  744/1311  3.83  3.58  3.85  3.97  3.83

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   0   2   3   1   0  2.83 1391/1490  3.10  3.53  4.05  4.11  2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   2   3   0   1   0  2.00 1495/1502  3.07  3.78  4.26  4.28  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  1  3  2  0  3.17 1379/1489  3.34  3.76  4.29  4.35  3.17
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   4   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00  4.10  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 301  0201            University of Maryland                                Page 1136
Title          INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I       Baltimore County                                     JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    KOGAN, JACOB                Fall  2006                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   2   8   1   3.67 1409/1669   4.04   4.12   4.23   4.28   3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   6   3   3.92 1220/1666   4.14   4.16   4.19   4.20   3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   6   3   4.00  969/1421   4.32   4.30   4.24   4.25   4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   2   1   3   2   3.63 1323/1617   4.01   4.09   4.15   4.22   3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   2   0   3   2   1   3.00 1427/1555   3.43   3.83   4.00   4.03   3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  1   1   2   5   1   3.40 1303/1543   4.06   4.06   4.06   4.14   3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   3   2   3   3   0   2.55 1584/1647   3.57   4.21   4.12   4.14   2.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  12   5.00    1/1668   4.95   4.75   4.67   4.68   5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0   1   2   5   3   3.91 1092/1605   3.97   3.87   4.07   4.09   3.91

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   5   7   4.58  703/1514   4.48   4.39   4.39   4.46   4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  11   4.92  460/1551   4.86   4.62   4.66   4.70   4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   4   6   1   3.58 1306/1503   3.75   4.03   4.24   4.28   3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   5   2   5   4.00 1069/1506   3.94   4.16   4.26   4.30   4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11  0   1   0   0   0   2.00 ****/1311   3.83   3.58   3.85   3.97   ****

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   1   0   2   2   2   3.57 1128/1490   3.10   3.53   4.05   4.11   3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   3   3   1   3.71 1231/1502   3.07   3.78   4.26   4.28   3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  1   0   3   3   0   3.14 1384/1489   3.34   3.76   4.29   4.35   3.14

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/  58   ****   5.00   4.22   4.29   ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11   0   0   1   0   0   0   2.00 ****/  52   ****   5.00   4.06   3.59   ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0   1   0   0   0   0   1.00 ****/  39   ****   5.00   4.39   3.82   ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0   0   1   0   0   0   2.00 ****/  40   ****   5.00   3.97   3.34   ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11   0   1   0   0   0   0   1.00 ****/  30   ****   5.00   4.33   3.49   ****

                                        Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course Section: MATH 301  0301                 University of Maryland                        Page 1137
Title          INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I            Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    HORTA, ARNALDO                   Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       35
Questionnaires: 24                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  3  7  13  4.33  816/1669  4.04  4.12  4.23  4.28  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  6  15  4.50  549/1666  4.14  4.16  4.19  4.20  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  4  18  4.63  441/1421  4.32  4.30  4.24  4.25  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  0  2  5   8  4.40  641/1617  4.01  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  3  2  2  4   5  3.38 1312/1555  3.43  3.83  4.00  4.03  3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 1  0  0  5   8  4.36  562/1543  4.06  4.06  4.06  4.14  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3  3  18  4.63  345/1647  3.57  4.21  4.12  4.14  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  1  0  22  4.91  641/1668  4.95  4.75  4.67  4.68  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0  1  2  7   9  4.26  678/1605  3.97  3.87  4.07  4.09  4.26

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  3  4  17  4.58  703/1514  4.48  4.39  4.39  4.46  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2  22  4.92  460/1551  4.86  4.62  4.66  4.70  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  2  6  15  4.46  637/1503  3.75  4.03  4.24  4.28  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1  1  0  2  2  18  4.57  585/1506  3.94  4.16  4.26  4.30  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 22 0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/1311  3.83  3.58  3.85  3.97  ****

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  4  0  2  1   3  2.90 1383/1490  3.10  3.53  4.05  4.11  2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0  2  0  2  3   3  3.50 1301/1502  3.07  3.78  4.26  4.28  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 2  0  1  3   4  3.70 1214/1489  3.34  3.76  4.29  4.35  3.70

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00  4.34  4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    23   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00  4.31  4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      23   0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00  4.45  4.13  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    0         0.00-0.99   0          A   2          Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0        Major        14
28-55    0         1.00-1.99   0          B   8                                      Under-grad   24       Non-major    10
56-83    9         2.00-2.99   8          C   7          General              1
84-150   6         3.00-3.49   3          D   1
Grad.    0         3.50-4.00   4          F   0          Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                          I   0          Other                22
                                          ?   6
```

```
Course Section: MATH 302  0101           University of Maryland                          Page 1138
Title       INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II        Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    RATHINAM, MURUH            Fall   2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires:  20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	852/1669	4.30	4.12	4.23	4.28	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	814/1666	4.30	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	728/1421	4.35	4.30	4.24	4.25	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	662/1617	4.38	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	715/1555	4.09	3.83	4.00	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	638/1543	4.27	4.06	4.06	4.14	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	591/1605	4.33	3.87	4.07	4.09	4.33

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	679/1514	4.60	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1239/1551	4.45	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	765/1503	4.37	4.03	4.24	4.28	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	680/1506	4.47	4.16	4.26	4.30	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1311	****	3.58	3.85	3.97	****

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1502	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	3.76	4.29	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

```
Course Section: MATH 381  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1139
Title        LIN. METH/OPER RESEARC      Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  POTRA, FLORIAN                   Fall  2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires: 17                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  1  3  4  8  4.00 1173/1669  4.00  4.12  4.23 4.28  4.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47  591/1666  4.47  4.16  4.19 4.20  4.47
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  0  0  1 15  4.71  344/1421  4.71  4.30  4.24 4.25  4.71
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  1  2  2 10  4.40  641/1617  4.40  4.09  4.15 4.22  4.40
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2  1  2  4  4  4  3.53 1212/1555  3.53  3.83  4.00 4.03  3.53
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 1  1  5  3  4.00  895/1543  4.00  4.06  4.06 4.14  4.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  1  0  1  3 10  4.40  651/1647  4.40  4.21  4.12 4.14  4.40
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  9  7  4.44 1248/1668  4.44  4.75  4.67 4.68  4.44
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  3  4  7  4.29  654/1605  4.29  3.87  4.07 4.09  4.29

              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  2  2  2  8  3  3.47 1394/1514  3.47  4.39  4.39 4.46  3.47
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  594/1551  4.88  4.62  4.66 4.70  4.88
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  1  0  4  7  4  3.81 1205/1503  3.81  4.03  4.24 4.28  3.81
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  4  5  7  4.06 1047/1506  4.06  4.16  4.26 4.30  4.06
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 9 0 2  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1311  ****  3.58  3.85 3.97  ****

              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 2  1  2  1  3.33 1233/1490  3.33  3.53  4.05 4.11  3.33
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0  1  2  3  4.33  818/1502  4.33  3.78  4.26 4.28  4.33
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1  2  3  4.33  865/1489  4.33  3.76  4.29 4.35  4.33
 4. Were special techniques successful                  11  4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00 4.10  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1      A   15      Required for Majors  1     Graduate      0      Major       6
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B    1
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    0      C    0      General              6     Under-grad   17      Non-major  11
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               9
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: MATH 401  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1140
Title      MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS             Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    STAFF                              Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.12	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.30	4.24	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.08	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	2.00	4.21	4.12	4.14	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.70	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.39	4.39	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1404/1551	4.00	4.62	4.66	4.73	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.03	4.24	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.00

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 404  0101              University of Maryland                    Page 1141
Title        INTRO PART DIFF EQ I            Baltimore County                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BELL, JONATHAN                  Fall  2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  3  5  7  6  3.76 1367/1669  3.76  4.12   4.23 4.39  3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  7  7  6  3.86 1273/1666  3.86  4.16   4.19 4.22  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  6 10  3  3.75 1135/1421  3.75  4.30   4.24 4.38  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  1  0  7  7  2  3.53 1364/1617  3.53  4.09   4.15 4.22  3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  2  4  3  6  5  3.40 1303/1555  3.40  3.83   4.00 4.08  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 1 1 4 4 7  3.88 1035/1543  3.88  4.06   4.06 4.18  3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  2  1  8 10  4.24  885/1647  4.24  4.21   4.12 4.14  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 12  8  4.40 1274/1668  4.40  4.75   4.67 4.70  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 1 7 5 2  3.38 1412/1605  3.38  3.87   4.07 4.16  3.38

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  1  1  6 11  4.42  923/1514  4.42  4.39   4.39 4.45  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67 1028/1551  4.67  4.62   4.66 4.73  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  2  5  5  6  3.68 1269/1503  3.68  4.03   4.24 4.27  3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  3  8  7  4.11 1025/1506  4.11  4.16   4.26 4.29  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 4 3 3 2 3  2.80 1186/1311  2.80  3.58   3.85 3.88  2.80

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  2  2  4  3  1  2.92 1377/1490  2.92  3.53   4.05 4.26  2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  1  2  6  2  1  3.00 1395/1502  3.00  3.78   4.26 4.46  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 2 2 3 1 3  3.09 1393/1489  3.09  3.76   4.29 4.52  3.09
4. Were special techniques successful                 11   7  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/1006  ****  3.55   4.00 4.21  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  5.00   4.22 3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00   4.06 3.80  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00   4.39 3.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   20  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00   3.97 3.81  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  5.00   4.34 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  5.00   4.31 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  46  ****  5.00   4.45 4.92  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  33  ****  5.00   4.25 3.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0      A   5      Required for Majors  1    Graduate    9    Major       7
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   9                                Under-grad  12   Non-major  14
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C   1      General              2    Under-grad  12   Non-major  14
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    1      D   0
Grad.      9      3.50-4.00    1      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                               responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               14
                                      ?   2
```

```
Course Section: MATH 407  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1142
Title        MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH          Baltimore County                                      JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TOLL, CHARLES                      Fall   2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 15                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  293/1669  4.73  4.12  4.23  4.39  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  516/1666  4.53  4.16  4.19  4.22  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  3  3  9  4.40  683/1421  4.40  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  7  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  496/1617  4.50  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  398/1555  4.44  3.83  4.00  4.08  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 0 0 5 5  4.50  390/1543  4.50  4.06  4.06  4.18  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  367/1647  4.60  4.21  4.12  4.14  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 4 1 7  4.25  690/1605  4.25  3.87  4.07  4.16  4.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  360/1514  4.80  4.39  4.39  4.45  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  358/1551  4.93  4.62  4.66  4.73  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 4 8  4.33  800/1503  4.33  4.03  4.24  4.27  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  3  4  8  4.33  838/1506  4.33  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 14 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/1311  ****  3.58  3.85  3.88  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 3 0 0  2.50 1431/1490  2.50  3.53  4.05  4.26  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 1 1 2  4.25  880/1502  4.25  3.78  4.26  4.46  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 1 3  4.75  434/1489  4.75  3.76  4.29  4.52  4.75


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    2       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     2      Major        7
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    9
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   0        C    1       General              7    Under-grad  13      Non-major    8
 84-150     6      3.00-3.49   5        D    1
 Grad.      2      3.50-4.00   5        F    0       Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                6
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course Section: MATH 410  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1143
Title          INTRO COMPLEX ANALYSIS         Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    KOGAN, JACOB                   Fall   2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 8                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  5  3  4.38  769/1669  4.38  4.12  4.23  4.39  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  6  1  4.00 1094/1666  4.00  4.16  4.19  4.22  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  710/1421  4.38  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   7  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1617  ****  4.09  4.15  4.22  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  533/1555  4.29  3.83  4.00  4.08  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 0  1  1  1  4.00  895/1543  4.00  4.06  4.06  4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  697/1647  4.38  4.21  4.12  4.14  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63 1106/1668  4.63  4.75  4.67  4.70  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  0  3  5  4.63  278/1605  4.63  3.87  4.07  4.16  4.63

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  6  2  4.25 1082/1514  4.25  4.39  4.39  4.45  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63 1083/1551  4.63  4.62  4.66  4.73  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  852/1503  4.29  4.03  4.24  4.27  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  521/1506  4.63  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.63

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  849/1490  4.00  3.53  4.05  4.26  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1502  5.00  3.78  4.26  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50  684/1489  4.50  3.76  4.29  4.52  4.50
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 421  0101                  University of Maryland                        Page 1144
Title          INTRODUCTION TO TOPOLO            Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    SEIDMAN, THOMAS                   Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  6                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  816/1669   4.33  4.12  4.23  4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  3  0  2  3.50 1466/1666   3.50  4.16  4.19  4.22  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  2  0  4  4.33  746/1421   4.33  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  863/1617   4.20  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  225/1555   4.67  3.83  4.00  4.08  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 2  4.20  723/1543   4.20  4.06  4.06  4.18  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  1  2  0  2  3.17 1510/1647   3.17  4.21  4.12  4.14  3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50 1190/1668   4.50  4.75  4.67  4.70  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 2 1  3.80 1172/1605   3.80  3.87  4.07  4.16  3.80

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  1  3  0  2  3.50 1389/1514   3.50  4.39  4.39  4.45  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  705/1551   4.83  4.62  4.66  4.73  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 1 2   3.83 1197/1503   3.83  4.03  4.24  4.27  3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  980/1506   4.17  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1311   ****  3.58  3.85  3.88  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 1   5.00 ****/1490   ****  3.53  4.05  4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 1   5.00 ****/1502   ****  3.78  4.26  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/1489   ****  3.76  4.29  4.52  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 426  0101                  University of Maryland                              Page 1145
Title      INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB                   Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   MUSCEDERE, MICH                        Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires: 11                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   1   4   6  4.45  662/1669  4.45  4.12  4.23  4.39  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   2   7  4.45  620/1666  4.45  4.16  4.19  4.22  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  429/1421  4.64  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  358/1617  4.64  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   2   1   1   2   5  3.64 1155/1555  3.64  3.83  4.00  4.08  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  274/1543  4.64  4.06  4.06  4.18  4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  112/1647  4.91  4.21  4.12  4.14  4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   3   8  4.73 1004/1668  4.73  4.75  4.67  4.70  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   0   0   2   2   6  4.40  499/1605  4.40  3.87  4.07  4.16  4.40

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   2   2   7  4.45  877/1514  4.45  4.39  4.39  4.45  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  512/1551  4.91  4.62  4.66  4.73  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   1   3   6  4.50  556/1503  4.50  4.03  4.24  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   2   2   7  4.45  706/1506  4.45  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0   0   1   1   8  4.70  174/1311  4.70  3.58  3.85  3.88  4.70

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   2   0   3  4.20  742/1490  4.20  3.53  4.05  4.26  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0   1   0   0   4  4.40  754/1502  4.40  3.78  4.26  4.46  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0   0   0   1   0   4  4.60  596/1489  4.60  3.76  4.29  4.52  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   3   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1006  ****  3.55  4.00  4.21  ****

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   9   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  4.61  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.40  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.39  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            9   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.20  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 430  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1146
Title        MATRIX ANALYSIS                   Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ZWECK, JOHN                       Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 17                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  6 11  4.65  419/1669   4.65  4.12  4.23  4.39  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  5 11  4.59  461/1666   4.59  4.16  4.19  4.22  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  5  9  4.44  645/1421   4.44  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  2  4  3  8  4.00 1029/1617   4.00  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  0  0  2  5  6  4.31  516/1555   4.31  3.83  4.00  4.08  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  2  0  0  6  8  4.13  807/1543   4.13  4.06  4.06  4.18  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  2  5  9  4.29  817/1647   4.29  4.21  4.12  4.14  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2 15  4.88  750/1668   4.88  4.75  4.67  4.70  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  1  0  0 11  4  4.06  877/1605   4.06  3.87  4.07  4.16  4.06

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  342/1514   4.81  4.39  4.39  4.45  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  358/1551   4.94  4.62  4.66  4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  0  5 10  4.50  556/1503   4.50  4.03  4.24  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  1  0  3 12  4.63  521/1506   4.63  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  9  1  0  0  2  3  4.00  587/1311   4.00  3.58  3.85  3.88  4.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  849/1490   4.00  3.53  4.05  4.26  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00 1013/1502   4.00  3.78  4.26  4.46  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  596/1489   4.60  3.76  4.29  4.52  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  2  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/1006   ****  3.55  4.00  4.21  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 226   ****  5.00  4.20  4.61  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 233   ****  3.56  4.19  4.40  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 225   ****  5.00  4.50  4.39  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            15  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 223   ****  5.00  4.35  4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 206   ****  5.00  4.15  4.20  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 112   ****  4.20  4.38  4.74  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  97   ****  4.50  4.36  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92   ****  3.50  4.22  4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     15  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 105   ****  4.13  4.20  4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 15  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  98   ****  4.40  3.95  3.86  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  15  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  58   ****  5.00  4.22  3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  15  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  52   ****  5.00  4.06  3.80  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        15  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39   ****  5.00  4.39  3.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    15  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40   ****  5.00  3.97  3.81  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30   ****  5.00  4.33  4.50  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  55   ****  5.00  4.34  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     15  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  42   ****  5.00  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       15  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  46   ****  5.00  4.45  4.92  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        15  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33   ****  5.00  4.25  3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      15  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29   ****  5.00  4.34  2.00  ****
```

```
Course Section: MATH 430  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1146
Title          MATRIX ANALYSIS              Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ZWECK, JOHN                   Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1        0.00-0.99   2        A    9      Required for Majors   1     Graduate      4     Major       10
28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B    2                                                      
56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1        C    2      General               7     Under-grad   13     Non-major    7
84-150    4        3.00-3.49   1        D    0                                                      
Grad.     4        3.50-4.00   7        F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    1                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 8
                                        ?    3
```

```
Course Section: MATH 441  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1147
Title        INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS          Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  STAFF                               Fall   2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  6                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  590/1669  4.50  4.12  4.23  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  777/1666  4.33  4.16  4.19  4.22  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  1  2  3.83 1100/1421  3.83  4.30  4.24  4.38  3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  641/1617  4.40  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1133/1555  3.67  3.83  4.00  4.08  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  580/1543  4.33  4.06  4.06  4.18  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  481/1647  4.50  4.21  4.12  4.14  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  789/1605  4.17  3.87  4.07  4.16  4.17


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  584/1514  4.67  4.39  4.39  4.45  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  705/1551  4.83  4.62  4.66  4.73  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  959/1503  4.17  4.03  4.24  4.27  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00 1069/1506  4.00  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  1  1  3  1  3.67  846/1311  3.67  3.58  3.85  3.88  3.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1490  ****  3.53  4.05  4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1502  ****  3.78  4.26  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1489  ****  3.76  4.29  4.52  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 475  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1148
Title       COMBINATORICS/GRAPH TH        Baltimore County                                    JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    GULER, OSMAN                   Fall   2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       9
Questionnaires:   7                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.16	4.19	4.22	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	886/1421	4.17	4.30	4.24	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.25	3.83	4.00	4.08	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1236/1543	3.57	4.06	4.06	4.18	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1480/1605	3.17	3.87	4.07	4.16	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1064/1514	4.29	4.39	4.39	4.45	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.62	4.66	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1380/1503	3.33	4.03	4.24	4.27	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	****	3.58	3.85	3.88	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.53	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1301/1502	3.50	3.78	4.26	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	****	3.76	4.29	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 479  0101                University of Maryland                            Page 1149
Title          MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S         Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ARMSTRONG, THOM                Fall   2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires: 10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  0  4  5  4.30  852/1669  4.30  4.12  4.23  4.39  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  6  3  4.20  957/1666  4.20  4.16  4.19  4.22  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  441/1421  4.63  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  5  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  161/1617  4.80  4.09  4.15  4.22  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  773/1555  4.00  3.83  4.00  4.08  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0  0  3  4  4.57  325/1543  4.57  4.06  4.06  4.18  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  1  0  1  0  3  5  4.33  759/1647  4.33  4.21  4.12  4.14  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0  3  6  4.67  239/1605  4.67  3.87  4.07  4.16  4.67

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  799/1514  4.50  4.39  4.39  4.45  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  880/1551  4.75  4.62  4.66  4.73  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  879/1503  4.25  4.03  4.24  4.27  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  1  1  3  3  4.00 1069/1506  4.00  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 5 0 1 0  1  0  3.00 ****/1311  ****  3.58  3.85  3.88  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1490  5.00  3.53  4.05  4.26  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  336/1502  4.80  3.78  4.26  4.46  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0  1  4  4.80  378/1489  4.80  3.76  4.29  4.52  4.80

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.20  4.38  4.74  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.13  4.20  4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  98  ****  4.40  3.95  3.86  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 601  0101                University of Maryland                          Page 1150
Title         MEASURE THEORY                    Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   GOWDA, MUDDAPPA                   Fall   2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  12                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1669   5.00  4.12  4.23 4.35  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83  157/1666   4.83  4.16  4.19 4.19  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  136/1421   4.92  4.30  4.24 4.33  4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1617   5.00  4.09  4.15 4.24  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  1  1  3   3  4.00  773/1555   4.00  3.83  4.00 4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 10  4.91  104/1543   4.91  4.06  4.06 4.27  4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  3   9  4.75  213/1647   4.75  4.21  4.12 4.15  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1668   5.00  4.75  4.67 4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2   9  4.82  135/1605   4.82  3.87  4.07 4.13  4.82

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  170/1514   4.92  4.39  4.39 4.37  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1551   5.00  4.62  4.66 4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  1  1  10  4.75  277/1503   4.75  4.03  4.24 4.22  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1506   5.00  4.16  4.26 4.24  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 9 0 0 0 0   1  5.00 ****/1311   ****  3.58  3.85 3.89  ****

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 2 1 0 1   3  3.29 1251/1490   3.29  3.53  4.05 4.18  3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 1 0 1 0   5  4.14  950/1502   4.14  3.78  4.26 4.46  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 1 0 1  5  4.43  776/1489   4.43  3.76  4.29 4.44  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  4  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/1006   ****  3.55  4.00 4.11  ****

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 226   ****  5.00  4.20 4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1  0  4.00 ****/ 233   ****  3.56  4.19 4.41  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 0 1   0  4.00 ****/ 225   ****  5.00  4.50 4.65  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 223   ****  5.00  4.35 4.48  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 206   ****  5.00  4.15 4.39  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 620  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1151
Title        NUMERICAL ANALYSIS I              Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MINKOFF, SUSAN                       Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44   676/1669  4.44  4.12  4.23  4.35  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   662/1666  4.43  4.16  4.19  4.19  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   3   1   4  4.13   916/1421  4.13  4.30  4.24  4.33  4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   1   1   5   1  3.75  1251/1617  3.75  4.09  4.15  4.24  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   1   3   3  4.00   773/1555  4.00  3.83  4.00  4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   2   4   2  4.00   895/1543  4.00  4.06  4.06  4.27  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   4   1   3  3.88  1187/1647  3.88  4.21  4.12  4.15  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   3   3   1  3.71  1241/1605  3.71  3.87  4.07  4.13  3.71

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50   799/1514  4.50  4.39  4.39  4.37  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   3   5  4.63  1083/1551  4.63  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   1   4   3  4.25   879/1503  4.25  4.03  4.24  4.22  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38   799/1506  4.38  4.16  4.26  4.24  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  1   0   1   5   1  3.63   875/1311  3.63  3.58  3.85  3.89  3.63

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   3   2   2  3.86   979/1490  3.86  3.53  4.05  4.18  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   286/1502  4.86  3.78  4.26  4.46  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   0   2   5  4.71   478/1489  4.71  3.76  4.29  4.44  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   292/1006  4.43  3.55  4.00  4.11  4.43

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 226  ****  5.00  4.20  4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 233  ****  3.56  4.19  4.41  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 225  ****  5.00  4.50  4.65  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 223  ****  5.00  4.35  4.48  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 206  ****  5.00  4.15  4.39  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 627  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1152
Title       INTR PARALLEL COMP             Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  GOBBERT, MATTHI               Fall   2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires:  6                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2  0  0  0  1  0  3 4.50  590/1669  4.50 4.12  4.23 4.35  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  881/1666  4.25 4.16  4.19 4.19  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  496/1617  4.50 4.09  4.15 4.24  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  1  1  1  1 3.50 1227/1555  3.50 3.83  4.00 4.07  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 390/1543  4.50 4.06  4.06 4.27  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  1  0  0  1  2  0 3.67 1321/1647  3.67 4.21  4.12 4.15  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1668  5.00 4.75  4.67 4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 373/1605 4.50 3.87  4.07 4.13  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  3  1 4.25 1082/1514  4.25 4.39  4.39 4.37  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1551  5.00 4.62  4.66 4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  1  2  1 4.00 1066/1503  4.00 4.03  4.24 4.22  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  2  0  2 4.00 1069/1506  4.00 4.16  4.26 4.24  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 445/1311  4.25 3.58  3.85 3.89  4.25


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1490  5.00 3.53  4.05 4.18  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1502  5.00 3.78  4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 684/1489  4.50 3.76  4.29 4.44  4.50


                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 635  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1153
Title          FINITE ELEMENTS             Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    SURI, MANIL                 Fall   2006                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    8
Questionnaires: 8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  1  0  2  5  4.38  769/1669   4.38  4.12  4.23  4.35  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  727/1666   4.38  4.16  4.19  4.19  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  5  3  4.38  710/1421   4.38  4.30  4.24  4.33  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  0  2  3  2  3.63 1323/1617   3.63  4.09  4.15  4.24  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  0  2  1  4  3.88  963/1555   3.88  3.83  4.00  4.07  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  180/1543   4.75  4.06  4.06  4.27  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  345/1647   4.63  4.21  4.12  4.15  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1668   5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  320/1605   4.57  3.87  4.07  4.13  4.57


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  441/1514   4.75  4.39  4.39  4.37  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1551   5.00  4.62  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  753/1503   4.38  4.03  4.24  4.22  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  1  0  3  4  4.25  909/1506   4.25  4.16  4.26  4.24  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1311   ****  3.58  3.85  3.89  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4  0  1  1  0  1  1  3.00 1328/1490   3.00  3.53  4.05  4.18  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4  0  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 1301/1502   3.50  3.78  4.26  4.46  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4  0  1  1  1  1  0  2.50 1468/1489   2.50  3.76  4.29  4.44  2.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1006   ****  3.55  4.00  4.11  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55   ****  5.00  4.34  4.45  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  42   ****  5.00  4.31  4.40  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46   ****  5.00  4.45  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33   ****  5.00  4.25  4.60  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29   ****  5.00  4.34  5.00  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: MATH 651  0101             University of Maryland                        Page 1154
Title      OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM          Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    GULER, OSMAN                Fall   2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires:  4                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50   590/1669  4.50  4.12  4.23  4.35  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25   881/1666  4.25  4.16  4.19  4.19  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   0   1   2  4.00   969/1421  4.00  4.30  4.24  4.33  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25   801/1617  4.25  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25   558/1555  4.25  3.83  4.00  4.07  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   2   2  4.50   390/1543  4.50  4.06  4.06  4.27  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50   481/1647  4.50  4.21  4.12  4.15  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  1501/1605  3.00  3.87  4.07  4.13  3.00


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   0   1   2  4.00  1199/1514  4.00  4.39  4.39  4.37  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   0   0   3  4.25  1338/1551  4.25  4.62  4.66  4.72  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   0   1   2  4.00  1066/1503  4.00  4.03  4.24  4.22  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   0   0   0   3  4.00  1069/1506  4.00  4.16  4.26  4.24  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   1   1   0   2  3.75   791/1311  3.75  3.58  3.85  3.89  3.75


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   622/1490  4.33  3.53  4.05  4.18  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   1   0   1   1  3.67  1253/1502  3.67  3.78  4.26  4.46  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0   1   0   0   2  4.00  1038/1489  4.00  3.76  4.29  4.44  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   1   1   0   0   0   1  3.00   923/1006  3.00  3.55  4.00  4.11  3.00


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/ 226  5.00  5.00  4.20  4.47  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/ 233  5.00  3.56  4.19  4.41  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/ 225  5.00  5.00  4.50  4.65  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/ 223  5.00  5.00  4.35  4.48  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/ 206  5.00  5.00  4.15  4.39  5.00


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/ 112  5.00  4.20  4.38  4.39  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  97  5.00  4.50  4.36  4.38  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  92  5.00  3.50  4.22  4.36  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/ 105  5.00  4.13  4.20  4.23  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  98  5.00  4.40  3.95  3.93  5.00


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  58  5.00  5.00  4.22  4.53  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  52  5.00  5.00  4.06  4.57  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  39  5.00  5.00  4.39  4.90  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  40  5.00  5.00  3.97  4.31  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  30  5.00  5.00  4.33  4.55  5.00


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  55  5.00  5.00  4.34  4.45  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  42  5.00  5.00  4.31  4.40  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  46  5.00  5.00  4.45  4.61  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  33  5.00  5.00  4.25  4.60  5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00     1/  29  5.00  5.00  4.34  5.00  5.00
```

Title   OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM   Baltimore County   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: GULER, OSMAN   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 4   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires: 1                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1669   5.00  4.12  4.23  4.35  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1666   5.00  4.16  4.19  4.19  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1617   5.00  4.09  4.15  4.24  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1543   5.00  4.06  4.06  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1668   5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1605   5.00  3.87  4.07  4.13  5.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1514   5.00  4.39  4.39  4.37  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1551   5.00  4.62  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1503   5.00  4.03  4.24  4.22  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1506   5.00  4.16  4.26  4.24  5.00


                                              Frequency Distribution

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