Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: JONES, CRISTEN

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 29

Page 1088 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

			Fre	eaue:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	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		7		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		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		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	_		1169/1647			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			1490/1605					
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	5		10	10	U	3.13	1490/1003	3.43	3.07	1.07	3.90	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	2	4	12	5	2 5/	1383/1514	3.68	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.54
	3	0	0	1	2	8	15		1254/1551	4.16	4.62	4.39	4.55	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0		0										
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3		2		6	12	-		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			1153/1506			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
_11														
Discussion		_	_			_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	1	3	1		****/1490	****		4.05	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	2	0	3	1		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		****/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		****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	-	-	-	-	-	-			,					

Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH

Instructor: JONES, CRISTEN

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1088 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	7	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 30

53

University of Maryland Page 1089 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH Instructor: JONES, CRISTEN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		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		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	2	0	2	2	6	6	11	2 01	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	0	12		1446/1551	4.16	4.62	4.39	4.55	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	1	-4	12		1225/1503	3.77	4.02	4.24	4.17	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	5	11		1262/1506	3.77	4.16	4.24	4.17	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3 4	8	5	2	7	2	T T		1202/1300			3.85	3.68	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	5	2	,	2	2	2.07	1200/1311	2.74	3.30	3.05	3.00	2.07
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	0.0	0	-	0	^	0	0	1 00	****/ ^=		4 50	4 25	4 10	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.50	4.36	4.19	****

Credits Ea	arned	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	1						

ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Title

Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1090 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	1		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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			1199/1514			4.39	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	3	6	5		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		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		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		****/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	1.0	0	0	0		0	-	4 00	/ 110	ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 20	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 105	****	4.13	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	U	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		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	5.00		4.30	****
	-	-	•	•		-	_		, 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

Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1090 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Title Instructor: SHEVCHENKO, OLE

Enrollment:

54 Questionnaires: 21 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1091 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	3	7	5		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		4.11	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		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		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		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		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	****
- 1														
Laboratory	1 4	_	_	0	^	0	1	F 00	**** / 006		F 00	4 00	2 00	***
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	6	0 1	0	0	0 2	1		****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>	15 15	0 5	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	146/ 233 ****/ 225	3.50 ****	3.56 5.00	4.19 4.50	4.09 4.42	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	***
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	13	J	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 200		3.00	1.13	1.01	
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		****/ 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		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97		****
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	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.45	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	5.00		4.23	***
J. Were energy proceeds for all the students	10	4	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 29		5.00	1.51	1.44	

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21

SHEVCHENKO, OLE 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1091 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

54 Questionnaires: 25

SOANE, ANA MARI

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1092 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	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		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		4.30	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		923/1514		4.39	4.39	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	4	13		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		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		4.16	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		1293/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	6	3	4		1326/1502	3.82	3.78	4.26	4.06	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9 8	0	3 1	2	4 1	2	5		1361/1489	3.76	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.25 ***
4. Were special techniques successful	8	14	1	U	1	0	Τ	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		3.50	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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 2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21		0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	4.50	4.36	4.19	****
<ol> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	22 22	2	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 92 ****/ 105	****	3.50 4.13	4.22	3.79 3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.13	3.95	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	3	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 96		4.40	3.93	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 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		****	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	****

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 25

Enrollment:

SOANE, ANA MARI 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1092 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	 А	 6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 38

# Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1093 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Commons				Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ceneral   Company   Comp	Ouestions	NR	NA		_			5				_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3. Did the instructor seeke clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did che exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1. Did the exam questions of the written assignments of the written assignments contribute to what you learned 1. Did the examination of the material presented in the subject 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were all instructor is lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor is lecture with you learned 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab intercor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did the lab intercor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did the lab intercor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did the lab intercor provide assistance 3. Did the lab intercor on the property of the material size of the property of the property of the provided assistance 3. Did the lab intercor provide assistance 3. Did the lab intercor provide assistance 3. Did the lab intercor on the property of the property of	******														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 6 30 4.71 23/1666 4.28 4.16 4.19 4.11 4.71 1.01 did cher evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 34 4.89 15/1412 4.52 4.30 4.24 4.11 4.79 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 2 6 19 4.63 37/1617 4.10 4.09 4.15 3.99 4.63 5.11 dansinged readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 9 0 1 3 2 12 4.00 73/1555 3.81 3.83 4.00 3.92 4.63 6.10 4.01 4.01 4.00 4.01 4.00 4.01 4.00 4.00	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1 0 0 0 1 2 34 4.89 15/1421 4.52 4.30 4.24 4.11 4.89 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50	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
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	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
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 14 3 0 0 3 6 12 4.00 73/1555 3.81 3.83 4.00 3.92 4.00 6 Did witten assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 29 4.78 188/1647 4.28 4.21 4.12 4.06 4.78 8.18 8.18 8.18 4.09 188/1647 4.28 4.21 4.12 4.06 4.78 8.18 8.18 8.18 4.09 188/1647 4.28 4.21 4.12 4.06 4.78 8.18 8.18 8.18 4.09 188/1647 4.28 4.21 4.12 4.06 4.78 8.18 8.18 8.18 4.54 350/1605 3.94 3.87 4.07 3.96 4.58 8.18 8.18 8.18 4.54 350/1605 3.94 3.87 4.07 3.96 4.58 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8	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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 1 19 0 1 1 3 2 12 4.39 534/1543 3.91 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.08 4.08 8.49 1.00 4 10 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1	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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 9 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 0 2 8 18 18 4.54 350/1605 3.94 3.87 4.07 3.96 4.54 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	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
8. How many times was class cancelled 9 1 0 0 0 0 28 9 4.24 1388/1668 4.33 4.75 4.67 4.62 4.24  1. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0 0 1 1 8 8 18 4.54 350/1605 3.94 3.87 4.07 3.96 4.54  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 8 27 4.79 855/1511 4.07 4.39 4.39 4.32 4.69  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 1 5 26 4.67 386/1503 4.15 4.03 4.24 4.17 4.67  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.87 212/1506 4.26 4.06 4.05 4.17 4.87  5. Did audiovinual techniques enhance your understanding 7 1 0 0 0 4 6 4.87 212/1506 4.26 4.16 4.26 4.17 4.87  5. Did audiovinual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1 0 0 1 0 5 10 12 4.14 778/1490 3.48 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.68 3.36  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Mere application activately encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage firs and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage first and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Definition and the designation of the second information of the provided with adequate background information and t	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
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   9   1   0   0   1   0   0   1   0   0   0	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
Lecture	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
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	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
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Tarkuna														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 27 4.79 825/1551 4.56 4.62 4.66 4.55 4.79 8 38		6	0	0	0	1	0	22	1 60	EE2/1E1/	1 17	1 20	4 20	1 22	4 60
8. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. 20 2 2 1 2 3 3 3 3.6 1013/1311 3.62 3.58 3.68 3.68  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  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 3.86 3.68  Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1 1 11 6 8 3.70 1214/1489 3.48 3.53 4.05 3.86 3.68  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 1 1 1 11 6 8 3.70 1214/1489 3.86 3.76 4.29 4.07 3.70  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. Did presentation				-	-					,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 20 2 1 0 2 3 3 3 3 3 10 13/1311 3.62 3.58 3.68 3.68 3.68 Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 11 6 8 3 3.70 144 778/1490 3.48 3.53 4.05 3.65 4.14 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 1 1 1 11 1 6 8 3 3.70 1214/1489 3.68 3.63 3.68 4.26 4.06 3.86 3.Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1 1 1 1 1 6 8 3 3.70 1214/1489 3.76 3.76 4.29 4.07 3.70 4. Were special techniques successful 20 8 1 2 1 4.00 ****/226 **** 5.00 4.20 3.81 3.50 3.65 4.19 4.09 3.00 4.00 ****/226 **** 5.00 4.20 3.81 3.60 4.00 4.00 ****/226 **** 5.00 4.20 3.81 3.60 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4															
Discussion  Discussion  Discussions contribute to what you learned  Discussion  Discussions contribute to what you learned  Discussions  Disc															
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 2.8 420 4.06 3.86 3.86 3.0 id the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1 1 1 6 8 3.70 1214/1489 3.76 3.76 4.29 4.07 3.70 4.08 respecial techniques successful 10 8 1 3 6 5 5 3.50 759/1006 3.50 3.55 4.00 3.81 3.50 4.08 were special techniques successful 10 8 1 1 1 1 6 8 3.70 1214/1489 3.76 3.76 4.29 4.07 3.70 4.08 respecial techniques successful 10 8 1 1 1 1 6 8 3.70 1214/1489 3.76 3.75 4.09 3.81 3.50 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	/	20	2	Т	2	3	3	3.36	1013/1311	3.62	3.58	3.85	3.68	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 6 8 3.76 1148/1502 3.82 3.78 4.26 4.06 3.86 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 8 1 1 1 1 6 8 3.70 1214/1489 3.76 3.76 4.29 4.07 3.70 1.00 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 6 8 3.70 1214/1489 3.76 3.76 4.29 4.07 3.70 3.70 1.00 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion   11   0   1   1   11   6   8   3.70   121/1489   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   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   4.00   3.81   3.50   3.50   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.50   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55   3.55	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
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24 10 0 0 1 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 3.00 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 6 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 5.00 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 30 7 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 5.00 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 30 7 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 226 **** 5.00 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 30 7 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 226 **** 5.00 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 30 7 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 206 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 30 6 0 0 1 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 **** 4. Did presentations 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 ****/ 92 **** 4.13 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 32 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.22 4.00 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 2 0 2 1 0 2.40 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.24 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 1 0 2 0 2 1 1 0 2.40 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.24 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.33 4.30 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 **** 5. Did study questions make cl	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
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 30 7 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 225 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 ****  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 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 223 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 ****  5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 30 6 0 0 0 1 1 0 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 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 92 **** 4.50 4.36 4.19 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 2 0 0 1 0 2.40 ****/ 98 **** 4.40 3.95 3.90 ****  4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 1 0 2 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.22 4.00 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.33 4.30 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.35 4.26 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.25 4.26 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 34 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	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
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24 10 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 **** 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 **** 5.00 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50	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
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24 10 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 **** 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 **** 5.00 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50	Laboratory														
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 **** 223 **** 5.00 4.50 4.42 **** 5.04 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.19 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.55 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 **** 5.00		24	1.0	Λ	Λ	1	2	1	4 00	****/ 226	****	5 00	4 20	3 08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 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 **** 5.00 4.00 **** / 206 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** 5.00 4.00 **** / 206 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** 5.00 4.00 **** / 206 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** / 207 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.25 4.15 4.01 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.25 4.01 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.25 4.20 **** / 208 **** 5.00 4.25 4.20 **** / 208 **** 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00	<del>_</del>														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30 7 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 223 **** 5.00 4.35 4.19 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 5 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 97 **** 4.50 4.38 4.04 ****  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 **** 92 **** 4.50 4.36 4.19 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  8. Were criteria for grading made clear  8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32 5 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 98 **** 4.40 3.95 3.90 ****  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0 1 0 2 0 2 1 0 2.40 **** 5.00 4.22 4.00 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 1 0 2 0 2 3.40 **** 5.00 4.06 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 4.13 4.20 3.94 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 4.00 **** 5.00 4.39 4.30 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 1 4.00 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 5.00 4.45 4.26 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 4.80 ****  5. Towas the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****															
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 6 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 206 **** 5.00 4.15 4.01 ****  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 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 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 ****/ 92 **** 4.13 4.20 3.94 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 32 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 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 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.33 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.39 4.30 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 2 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.45 4.26 *****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****								_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 6 0 0 1 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 **** / 92 **** 4.40 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 32 5 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 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 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 0 1 1 4.50 **** / 40 **** 5.00 4.33 4.30 ****   5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 40 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 ****   5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** / 42 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 ****   4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** / 46 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****   5. Out 4.06 ****   5. Out 4.06 ****   5. Out 4.07 ****   5. Out 4.07 ****   5. Out 4.00 ****   5.															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 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 **** 92 **** 4.13 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 32 5 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 98 **** 4.40 3.95 3.90 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 5.00 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0 1 0 2 0 2 1 0 2.40 **** 5.00 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you discuss your evaluation 33 2 0 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 0 1 1 4.50 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.00 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.00 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****															
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 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 1 4.33 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.31 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.34 4.17 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0 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 4.34 4.17 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****			_	_											
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 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 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.39 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 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 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 2 0 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****															
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 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 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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****								-		,					
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 1 0 2.40 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.00 3.81 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 52 *** 5.00 4.39 4.30 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 33 3 0 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 0 1 3 1 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 5.00 4.31 4.08 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 33 2 0 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****								-		,					
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 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 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 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 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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****				-	-		-	•							
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 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 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 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 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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	5	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.40	3.95	3.90	****
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 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 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 **** 5.00 4.33 4.30 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 **** 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 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 0 2 0 4.00 **** 33 *** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****	Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 33	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	****
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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****		33	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****	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	***
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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****		33	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33		****
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 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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****	Colf Pered														
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 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****		22	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	2	1	4 00	****/	****	E 00	1 21	1 17	****
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 ****										,					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 33 3 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.25 4.25 ****										,					
1. Mad the recadative each respect to the second field th								-		, 10					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 55 5 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ^^^/ 29 ^^^ 5.00 4.34 4.22 ^^^^	7							-		,					
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	3	U	U	Τ.	Т	U	3.50	/ 29		5.00	4.34	7.22	

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 38

RILEY, SAMANTHA 53

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1093 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	4	 А	16	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 1094 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	2	2 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		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		1404/1503	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		1327/1506	4.15	4.16	4.24	4.17	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	2	0	1	2	0		****/1311				3.68	****
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	Ι/	2	U	_	4	U	2.00	/1311	3.02	3.30	3.03	3.00	
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		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		1361/1489			4.29	4.07	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	1	1	1			****/1006			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														
	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	++++/ 110	****	4 00	4 20	1 01	++++
<ol> <li>Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme</li> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> </ol>	23 24	1 0	0 1	1 0	0	0	0		****/ 112 ****/ 97	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.36	4.19 3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	4.13	4.20 3.95	3.94	***
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	44	U	U		U	U	U	2.00	7 96		4.40	3.93	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		****/ 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

Instructor: FAGAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1094 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	4	 А	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Title

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 15

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1095 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
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	4.2
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	4.4
1. 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	3.8
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	2.7
. 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	4.0
. 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	4.0
B. 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	5.0
. 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	3.8
Lecture														
. 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	4.6
. 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	4.7
. 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	4.0
. 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	4.2
. 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	3.8
Discussion														
. 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	3.1
. 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	3.8
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	4.5
. 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														
. 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	***
Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27 6 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		 Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 s	3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	1						

ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Title

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 47

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1096 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eva.	luatio	on (	Dues	sti	onn	ıai	re

			Fre	que:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	5	9	14	18		1207/1669		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		1011/1617		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		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	7	^	0	0	_	7	20	4 57	715/1514	4 47	4 20	4 20	4 22	4 57
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7 9	0	0	0	5	7	28	4.57	-, -			4.39	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0 3	5 6	3 10	30 19	4.00	1042/1551 941/1503	4.56	4.62	4.66 4.24	4.55	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	1	6	9	21	4.10	819/1506	4.15 4.26	4.03 4.16	4.24	4.17 4.17	4.18 4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	23	2	0	6	3	4	3.47	961/1311		3.58	3.85		3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	23	2	U	O	3	4	3.47	961/1311	3.02	3.50	3.03	3.00	3.4/
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		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		1218/1489	3.76	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	15	21	1	1	5	1	3		****/1006	3.50	3.55	4.00	3.81	****
1. Nete special commiques successful		2.1	_	_	5	_	5	3.30	, 1000	3.30	3.33	1.00	3.01	
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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced	4.0		0	_	-	_		4 60	/ 55	als als als als	F 00	4 2 4	4 10	ate ate ate ate
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	4		****/ 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 ****/ 33	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43 43	3	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	5.00	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	3	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 29		5.00	4.34	4.22	

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 47

Enrollment:

BARADWAJ, RAJAL 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1096 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: STARK, BETSY

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 41

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1097 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	1	7	10	19		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		4.39	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		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		4.54		4.26		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 -	0	2	2		_	1.0	2 55	1000/1400	2 40	2 52	4 05	2 05	2 55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	3	4	3	13		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		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.19	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	2	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	3	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	30	3	U	_	U	U		3.30	/ 200		3.00	4.13	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		****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.13	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	3	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	4.40	3.95	3.90	****
J J														
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		****/ 55	****		4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	2	0	0	0	3		****/ 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	***

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: STARK, BETSY

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1097 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	А	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: STARK, BETSY

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 26

Fall

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1098 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	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		4.16	4.26	4.17	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	513/1311			3.85	3.68	4.14
Discussion														
	10	0	2	0	3	4	_	2 71	1060/1400	2 40	2 [2	4 05	2 05	2 71
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12 10	0	2 2	0	2	4	5 9	4.06	1062/1490	3.48	3.53 3.78	4.05 4.26	3.85 4.06	3.71 4.06
		0	3	0	1	2	9 7		990/1502				4.06	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	13 10	13	2	0	1	0	0		1186/1489 ****/1006	3.76 3.50	3.76	4.29	3.81	3.// ****
4. Were special techniques successiui	10	13	۷	U	Т	U	U	1.07	/1006	3.50	3.33	4.00	3.01	
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		****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34		****
5. Here chere chagn proceeds for all the betweenes	2.1	_	J	0	0	_	0	1.00	, 25		3.00	1.51	1.22	

Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC

Instructor: STARK, BETSY

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1098 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC

Title Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 9

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1099 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		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	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	0	0		****/1311	****	3.58	3.85	3.68	****
5. Dia dadiovidual ecomiqued emanee jour anderstanding	-	,	_	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	1.00	, 1311		3.30	3.03	3.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	3	1		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		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		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	3.79	3.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	68/ 98	3.80	4.13	3.95		3.80
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	4	U	U	_	_	_	4	3.00	08/ 98	3.00	4.40	3.95	3.90	3.00
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

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 9

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1099 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: MATH 115 0201 Title

FINITE MATHEMATICS

Instructor: CIPCIGAN, IOANA

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1100 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	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			4.39	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			4.18	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		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
Diamondon														
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	2	2	2 56	1135/1490	3.56	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11 11	0	0	1	2	0	3 6	4.22	900/1502	4.22	3.78	4.05	4.06	4.22
		0	1	0	2	0	-			4.22				4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11 11	6	2	0	0	0	6 1		1006/1489 ****/1006	****	3.76	4.29	4.07	****
4. Were special techniques successful	ΤT	О	2	U	U	U	Τ	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		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.06	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.45	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****		4.25	4.23	****
J. Were there enough procedus for all the students	エラ	U	U	U	U	U	т	5.00	/ 49		5.00	4.34	4.44	

Course Section: MATH 115 0201
Title FINITE MATHEMATICS
Instructor: CIPCIGAN, IOANA

Instructor: CIPCIGAN, Enrollment: 34

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1100 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I

Title TIGHE, BONNY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1101 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	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		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		4.67	, -		4.21	4.12	4.06	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0 1	0	0	14 3	4 9		1400/1668	4.22	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	Τ	0	U	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		4.82		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
5. Dia addiovibadi commiques cimanee jour anaciscanding	3	,	Ü	_	_	-	3	1.22	101/1311	1.22	3.30	3.03	3.00	1.22
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		****/ 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		****/ 105	****	4.13	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	U	U	U	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		****/ 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	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out riving acceptates		Ü	Ü	Ü	0	·	_	3.00	, 50		3.00	1.33	1.50	
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		4.22	***
- <del>-</del>														

Title MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1101 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Title Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 151 Questionnaires: 59

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1102 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect 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	-,		4.75	4.67		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		4.39	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		1069/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	6	10	12	20		1190/1502		3.78	4.26	4.06	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	5	11	10	22		1125/1489		3.76	4.29		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		****/ 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		****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 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	1.27	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	2	4		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	1	1	4		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 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	****

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 151
Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1102 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 14	0.00-0.99	8	 А	17	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 142
Questionnaires: 69

# Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1103 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
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		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
<u> </u>														
Lecture	2	0	^	0	0	11	F 2	4 77	400/1514	4 76	4 20	4 20	4 20	4 77
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	11	53		408/1514		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 4	14 8		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	1	1	9		52	4.71	421/1506	4.65	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	Т	U	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 50	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		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		1191/1489	3.81	3.76	4.29		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	
i. Were apecial ecciniques auccessiui	13	33	3		O	3	,	3.22	007/1000	3.20	3.33	1.00	3.01	5.22
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		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	5	1	1	3	2	2		****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	9	0	0	2	1	2		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL

Enrollment: 142
Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1103 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	 А	19	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	2						

Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment:

135 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1104 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	:S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	11	18	19		1152/1669		4.12		4.02	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	12	32	4.45			4.16	4.19	4.11	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	11			557/1421		4.30		4.11	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	28	0	1	5	8			1005/1617		4.09		3.99	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	1	5	8		4.00	773/1555		3.83	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	30	0	0	9	3		3.95	,		4.06	4.06	3.86	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1		13			885/1647		4.21	4.12	4.06	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	1			731/1668					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			1177/1489		3.76	4.29	4.07	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	9	22	1	4	6	6			819/1006				3.81	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 226		5.00		3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	1	3		****/ 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		4.26	****
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	****
Frequ	ency.	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Charlier Found Charles Charles	-								m				M	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	 А	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	

I 0 Other 35 ? 1

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I SLOWIKOWSKI, WI Fall 2006

Page 1105 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 81 Questionnaires: 51

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

						Fr	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		General		_													
		w insights, skills from		6	0	0	0	13	16	16		1131/1669		4.12	4.23	4.02	4.07
		tor make clear the exp		6	0	0	0	6	11	28	4.49			4.16	4.19	4.11	4.49
		estions reflect the ex		6	0	0	1	0	13			417/1421		4.30		4.11	
		ations reflect the exp	3	6	24	0	0	4	5		4.38			4.09	4.15		4.38
	_	adings contribute to w	_	6	24	0	3	5	7	6		1054/1555		3.83	4.00	3.92	3.76
		ignments contribute to	_	6	27	0	1	4	4	9		,		4.06	4.06	3.86	4.17
		system clearly explai	ned	6	0	0	0	2	8	35		232/1647		4.21	4.12		4.73
	_	was class cancelled		6	0	0	0	0	42			1498/1668		4.75		4.62	
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overall teach	ing 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 t	he instru	ctor's lectures well p	repared	6	0	0	0	0	13	32	4 71	505/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.71
		tor seem interested in	_	6	0	0	0	4	13	28		1168/1551		4.62	4.66	4.55	4.53
		erial presented and ex		6	0	0	0	5	17		4.40				4.24	4.17	
		s contribute to what y		6	0	0	0	3	12			547/1506					
		techniques enhance yo		6	31	3	1	4	2			1069/1311					
5. Did au	laiovisuai	techniques enhance yo	our understanding	0	31	3	1	4	4	4	3.21	1009/1311	3.75	3.30	3.03	3.00	3.21
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribute to w	hat 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 a	all studen	ts 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 th	ne instruc	tor 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 s	special te	chniques successful	-	9	36	2	3	0	0	1	2.17	****/1006	3.38	3.55	4.00	3.81	****
		Laboratory															
		rease understanding of		48	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 226		5.00	4.20	3.98	****
		ed with adequate backs		49	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 233		3.56	4.19	4.09	****
4. Did th	ne lab ins	tructor provide assist	ance	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
		Seminar															
1 Did pr	ogontatio	ns contribute to what	wou loarned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 105	****	4.13	4.20	3.94	****
		or grading made clear	you rearried	50	0	1	0	0	0	-		****/ 98		4.13			****
5. were c	eriteria i	or grading made clear		50	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/ 98		4.40	3.95	3.90	
		Field Work															
2. Did yo	ou clearly	understand your evalu	ation criteria	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
1 54	.16	Self Paced	1 J	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 55	****	F 00	1 21	4 17	****
I. Dia se	ell-paced	system contribute to w	mat you learned	50	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 55		5.00	4.34	4.1/	
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.S			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	15	0.00-0.99 5	A 23		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		-				J						3 -		
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5						1				1	Under-q	rad !	51	Non-	-major	50
84-150	0	D 1									3				3		
Grad.	0	F 0		F:1	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh	
02 00.	Ü	P 0								-	respons				_	,	
					<b>∩</b> +	her				2	8	LCDPOHB		o bigi	cai		

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 31

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1106 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	11	23	4.45	306/1666	4.03	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	24	4.71	344/1421	4.21	4.10	4.19	4.11	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	2	15	4.60	394/1617	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	3	7	11	4.00	773/1555	3.87	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	1	1	2	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	4.00	4.12	4.06	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	5		1438/1668	4.65	4.75	4.12	4.62	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	0	25 6	17	4.58	313/1605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.17
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	1	U	U	O	1 /	4.50	313/1003	3.94	3.07	4.07	3.90	4.50
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		****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_		_	
				2	0						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Ouestions

General

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 60
Ouestionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1107 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

1 1		Genera			•	0	0	0	2	1.0	1.0	4 21	0.40./1		4 00	4 10	4 00	4 00	4 21
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	2 2	3 1	10	17 20	4.31				4.12	4.23	4.02	4.31
		tor make clear	0	0	1		_	9		4.47	605/1		4.21	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.47		
			s reflect the expected goals reflect the expected goals					0	1	9	21	4.53			4.39	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.53
			_		1	15	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	801/1		4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.25
				what you learned	0	13	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	773/1			3.83	4.00	3.92	4.00
				what you learned		16	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	857/1		3.98	4.06	4.06	3.86	4.06
		system clearl		inea	0	0	0	0	2	3	27		185/1		4.32	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.78
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	27	5		1444/1		4.65	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.16
9. How wou	ala you g	rade the overa	ıll teacr	ning effectiveness	4	2	0	1	1	10	14	4.42	473/1	.605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.42
		Lectur	re																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	es well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	291/1	514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.84
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	954/1	551	4.54	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.72
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	ed and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	11	19	4.53	528/1	503	4.05	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.53
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	23	4.59	556/1	506	4.18	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.59
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques er	hance yo	our understanding	0	24	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	357/1	311	3.75	3.58	3.85	3.68	4.38
		Discus	ssion																
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	4	2	9	8	7	3.40	1215/1	490	3.33	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.40
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	l to participate	3	0	1	4	8	4	12	3.76	1208/1	502	3.49	3.78	4.26	4.06	3.76
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	3	0	3	4	4	4	14		1191/1		3.58	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.76
		chniques succe		-	3	15	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	920/1	.006	3.38	3.55	4.00	3.81	3.07
		Labora	+ 02077																
2. Were vo	Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information						0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
				or lab activities	31 31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance					31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	5.00	4.35	4.19	***
		-: 11	1																
1 Did fid	ald armar	Field		nat you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/	58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
				ation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	52	****	5.00	4.22	3.81	****
		tor available			31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	39	****	5.00		4.30	****
					-	-		-	-	_	_		,						
1 541	16	Self		1 t	2.1	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	/			F 00	4 24	4 17	****
				what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
		ions make clea			31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	
3. Were yo	our conta	cts with the i	nstructo.	or helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	***
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs				Тур	e			Majors	\$
00-27	 9	0.00-0.99	0	A 10								2				0			0
28-55	9 7	1.00-0.99	1	A 10 B 13		Ke	quir	ed f	OT IV	ıa jor	D)	4	Grad	luate		U	Majo	т.	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C 4		Ger	nera	1				0	IInde	r-gr	ad 3	2	Non-	major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		Ge.	c.a	-				5	JIIGE	- 9r	aa 3	-	14011	, О т	۵4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E.1	ecti [.]	ves				1	####	: – M	eans t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	5	P 0								_				e sign		_	,
				I O		O+1	her				2	:5		JUC	_ 00 1	911			
	? 1										_	-							

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 69
Questionnaires: 36

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1108 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						s			ructor	Course	_	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		4.16	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		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		****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 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		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31		****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34		****
Process						-	-		,					

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	2	 А	16	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27	-		-	
				2	0						

CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Title Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 56 Questionnaires: 34

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1109 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fro	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did		General w insights,skil	_	this source	0	0	0	1	1	5	27	4.71	331/1669	4.03	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.71
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	11	23	4.71	345/1666	4.03	4.12	4.19	4.11	4.71
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	318/1421	4.39	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.73
	_	ations reflect	_	-	0	6	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	347/1617	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.64
		adings contribu	_	_	1	7	0	0	6	4	16	4.38	453/1555	3.87	3.83	4.00	3.92	4.38
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	ibute 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 th	e grading	system clearly	explair	ned	1	0	0	0	1	9	23	4.67	302/1647	4.32	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.67
8. How ma:	ny times	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	0	11	20	4.65	1087/1668	4.65	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.65
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teachi	ing effectiveness	8	3	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	210/1605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.70
		Lecture	9															
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	240/1514		4.39	4.39	4.32	4.88
					1 1	0	0	0	1	2	30	4.88	594/1551	4.54	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.88
	s lecture material presented and explained clea d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	277/1503	4.05	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.76
	the lectures contribute to what you learned				1 2	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	313/1506	4.18	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.79
5. Did au	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understar					20	2	0	0	1	9	4.25	445/1311	3.75	3.58	3.85	3.68	4.25
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to wh	nat 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 a	ll studen	its actively end	couraged	to participate	9	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	613/1502	3.49	3.78	4.26	4.06	4.52
				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 s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		9	11	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	333/1006	3.38	3.55	4.00	3.81	4.36
		Semina																
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the a	announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.04	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	рe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	 1	 Д 14		Red	 quir		 or M	 aior		3	Graduat	 -	0	Majc	 r	0
28-55						110	4022	-	·	w ) 0 =		5	or adda o	_	Ü	11000	-	· ·
56-83						Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	4	Non-	major	34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 1									3				,	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her				2	15						
				? 0														

Course Section: MATH 151 0601 University of Maryland
Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: WILSON, MARY C

Enrollment: 57
Ouestionnaires: 32

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1110

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 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 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	С	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	24	-			
				?	2						

Course Section: MATH 151 0701 University of Maryland Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1111

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 25 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

WILSON, MARY C

							т т.	-quei	1010,	_		1110	CIUCCOI	COULDC	DCPC	OFIDC	TC A C T	DCCC
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	7	8	8	4.04	1145/1669	4.03	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.04
		ctor make clear				0	0	1	4	7	12		881/1666				4.11	
		uestions reflect			2	0	1	1	0	2		4.61			4.30		4.11	4.61
	_	uations reflect				8	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1262/1617	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	3.73
				what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	8			889/1555		3.83	4.00	3.92	3.94
				o what you learned		13	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	608/1543	3.98	4.06	4.06	3.86	4.30
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	666/1647	4.32	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.39
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	641/1668	4.65	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.91
				hing effectiveness	12	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1057/1605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.92
		Lecture	<u>-</u>															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	489/1514	4.47	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.73
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	861/1503	4.05	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.27
4. Did th	e lectur	es 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 au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				3	12	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	699/1311	3.75	3.58	3.85	3.68	3.90
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	5	0	3	2	5	3	7	3.45	1184/1490	3.33	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.45
				d to participate	4	0	2	5					1357/1502					
				d open discussion		0	0	6	3	5	6	3.55	1258/1489	3.58	3.76	4.29	4.07	
		echniques succes				17	1	0					****/1006				3.81	***
				Fred	uencs	/ Dis	tri b	1+ i 01	<b>1</b>									
				1109	acric	DIS	CIID	20101										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А б		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	====== =	0	Majo	r )r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			_											
56-83		2.00-2.99	2	C 6		Ge	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad 2	5	Non-	-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	cad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot	her				1	.1						
				? 0														

Course Section: MATH 151 0801 University of Maryland
Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1112

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 24
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

WILSON, MARY C

Instructor:

								eque:			_		tructor		_	UMBC		Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	1	1	3	9	9	4.04	1145/1669	4.03	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.04
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	1	2	2	5	13	4.17			4.16	4.19	4.11	4.17
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	847/1421	4.39	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.22
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	15	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.00
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr:	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	970/1647	4.32	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.13
	-	was class cand			3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	357/1668	4.65	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.95
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	1	2	2	11	1	3.53	1348/1605	3.92	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.53
		Lectur	_	_														
	ne instructor's lectures well prepared e instructor seem interested in the subject				1	0	1	0	1	5	16		775/1514			4.39	4.32	4.52
							1	0	1	3	18		1111/1551			4.66	4.55	4.61
					1		1	2	3	12	5		1220/1503		4.03	4.24	4.17	3.78
		es contribute t		-	1	0	2	0	5		12		1051/1506		4.16	4.26	4.17	4.04
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	16	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1311	3.75	3.58	3.85	3.68	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did ala	aga diga			what you learned	_	0	5	2	6	2	2	2 74	1408/1490	3.33	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.74
				d to participate	6	0	1	3	6	4	<i>Δ</i>		1343/1502		3.78	4.05	4.06	3.39
				d open discussion	6	0	1	2	3	6			1181/1489		3.76	4.29	4.07	3.78
		echniques succe		a open arseassion	6	16	1	0	0	0			****/1006				3.81	****
i. Were by	pcciai c	cciniiques succe	BBLUI		O	10	_	U	O	O	_	3.00	7 1000	3.30	3.33	1.00	3.01	
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Red	guir	ed f	or M	aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 5								-		-	-			-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.5	_					
				? 0														

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1113 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		****/ 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	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	1						

CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Title

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1114

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	es 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect 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		4.21	4.12	4.06	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97		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		4.39	4.39	4.32	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	7	29		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		4.16	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		3.53	4.05	3.85	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	3	11	8	17		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		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		****/ 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		****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 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		****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 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	****

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 40

Baltimore County SONG, YOON J Fall 2006

Page 1114 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: SONG, YOON J

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 29

OON J Fall 2006

Page 1115 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

O L	a	Ti 1 +	0
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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	0	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		4.39	4.39	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	3	23		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		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		****/ 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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	 А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				2	0						

Course Section: MATH 152 0301 Title

CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 25

# Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1116 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	Λ	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	7.1	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	2	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		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	ΤΟ	16	4.17	249/1605	4.42	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	1	U	U	3	10	4.05	249/1005	4.42	3.07	4.07	3.90	4.05
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
1									,					
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		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
1. Here special committees successful	ŭ		·	_	_	_	,	1.10	307, 1000	3.33	3.33	1.00	3.01	1.10
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2.4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
2. 214 154 Steart and stand four evaluation effective		•	_	J	J	0	0	1.00	, 52		3.00	1.00	3.51	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				?	0						

CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Title KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1117 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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	,	4.52	4.30	4.24	4.11	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	1	2	3		4.22	, -		4.09		3.99	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	3	5	3	8	3.84		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		4.21	4.06	4.06	3.86	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5				4.64	4.21		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	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.2	4 00	000/1514	4 77	4 20	4 20	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0		4.88	223/1514		4.39	4.39	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	-	0	-	0	4 6	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		1	2	2	25 29	4.62		4.57	4.03		4.17	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1 1			4.65		4.62	4.16	4.26	4.17	
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		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		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		3.53	3.55	4.00	3.81	
1. Were special ecciniques successivi	5	22	_	U	1	O	_	3.07	051/1000	3.33	3.33	1.00	3.01	3.07
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		****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	2			****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 206	****	5.00		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		****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34		****
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	****

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor:

Baltimore County KAPOOR, JAGMOHA Fall 2006

Page 1117 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 34

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 20 Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1118 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		****/1006		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		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 97	****	4.50	4.36	4.19	****
		-	Ü	Ü	Ü	ŭ	_	3.00	, , , , , , ,		1.50	1.50	,	
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		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	****

Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY

Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1118 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

#### Course Section: MATH 152H 0101 University of Maryland CALC/ANALY GEOM II-HON Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH Fall 2006

?

0

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1119

								_	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	662/1666	4.43	4.16	4.19	4.11	4.43
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.30	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.09	4.15	3.99	4.57
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	401/1647	4.57	4.21	4.12	4.06	4.57
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did th	the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.71
3. Was le	lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	686/1503	4.43	4.03	4.24	4.17	4.43
4. Did th	s lecture material presented and explained clea I the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.16	4.26	4.17	4.86
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.58	3.85	3.68	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1341/1489	3.33	3.76	4.29	4.07	3.33
				Frequ	ency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	anir	ed f	or Ma	aior		1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		110	-1 CTT.	ca I	OI 111	، ۲۰ ر	_	_	Gradat	_	•	110000	-	_
56-83						Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	-major	6
84-150							a	_				-	011001 9			2.011		ŭ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
	-		-	P 0		_							respons				_	•
				I 0		Ot	her					4						

Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 20

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1120 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_			_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	7	6	2	0		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	./	2	0		1652/1666		4.16	4.19	4.11	2.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	7	6	4	1		1390/1421		4.30	4.24	4.11	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	4	3	3	2	0		1606/1617		4.09	4.15	3.99	2.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	2	4	4	0		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		1520/1543		4.06	4.06	3.86	2.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	4	5	4		1512/1647		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		4.67		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 70	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		1489/1502		3.78	4.26	4.06	2.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	7	1	3	1	_		1486/1489		3.76	4.29	4.07	
5. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	0	U	,	1	J		U	1.03	1400/1409	2.49	3.70	4.20	4.07	1.03
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		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	4.00	****
4. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	U	1	U	U	U	U	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		****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	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	****

Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1120 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course Section: MATH 155 0201 Title

ELEMENTARY CALCULUS

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1121 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	3	0	0	1	5	6	12	4.21	976/1669	2.98	4.12	4.23	4.02	4.21
-	_	tor make clear			2	0	1	1	4	5	14	4.20	957/1666			4.19	4.11	4.20
		estions reflec			3	0	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	939/1421			4.24	4.11	4.08
		ations reflect			3	6	1	3	3	5	6		1301/1617			4.15	3.99	3.67
				what you learned	3	5	3	2	1	6	7		1155/1555			4.00	3.92	3.63
				to what you learned	3	8	3	3	2	4	4		1365/1543			4.06	3.86	3.19
		system clearl			3	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42				4.12	4.06	4.42
		was class cand		221100	3	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	844/1668			4.67	4.62	4.83
	-			ching effectiveness	11	1	1	0	1	9	4	4.00				4.07		4.00
		Lectur																
1 Were +1	he instru	ctor's lecture.	_	nrenared	4	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	727/1514	3.65	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.57
					4	0	1	0	2	3	17		1176/1551		4.62	4.66	4.55	4.52
	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clethe lectures contribute to what you learned				5	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	765/1503			4.24	4.17	4.36
	the lectures contribute to what you learned				4	0	-	1	-	-								
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0		2	8	12		828/1506			4.26	4.17	4.35
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	6	12	1	3	1	0	4	3.33	1027/1311	2.83	3.58	3.85	3.68	3.33		
		Discus																
				what you learned	9	0	0	2	1	6	9	4.22	718/1490			4.05	3.85	4.22
				ed 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	e instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd 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 s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		11	7	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	694/1006	3.67	3.55	4.00	3.81	3.67
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were ye	ou provid	ed with adequa	te bacl	ground information	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.09	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribu	te to v	what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
				luation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52		5.00		3.81	****
z. Dia yo	a crearry	-		raderon erreeria	20	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	J	J	1.00	, 32		3.00	1.00	3.01	
1. Did se	lf-paced	Self system contrib		what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
				-				-					, 55					
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 jor	 s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	0		
28-55							_			-						,		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-9	rad	27	Non-	-major	27
84-150													3				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	D 0 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means	there a	re not	enous	rh	
	=	2.22 2.00	0	P 0									respons				_	, -
				I O		∩+1	ner				1	.7	10050110					
				3 0		001						•						
				. 0														

Course Section: MATH 155 0301 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS Baltimore County

Instructor:

LYNN, YEN-MOW

University of Maryland Page 1122
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 15
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies	5			tructor		Dept		Level	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	3	5	3	3	0	2.43	1655/1669	2.98	4.12	4.23	4.02	2.43
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	7	0	7	0	0	2.00	1660/1666	2.83	4.16	4.19	4.11	2.00
		uestions reflec			1	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	1377/1421	3.25	4.30	4.24	4.11	2.93
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	8	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1448/1617	3.08	4.09	4.15	3.99	3.33
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1464/1647	3.64	4.21	4.12	4.06	3.36
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	7	4	0	0	0	1.36	1603/1605	2.28	3.87	4.07	3.96	1.36
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	4	0	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1492/1503	2.67	4.03	4.24	4.17	2.00
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						5	3	2	0	2	2.25	1482/1506	2.87	4.16	4.26	4.17	2.25
		Discus																
				what you learned	10	0	3	1	0	1	0		1482/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	1.80
				d to participate	10	0	1	1	1	1			1395/1502		3.78	4.26	4.06	3.00
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1487/1489	2.49	3.76	4.29	4.07	1.75
		Labora																
				ground information		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233		3.56	4.19	4.09	****
4. Did th	he lab in	structor provid	e assis	tance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	 aior	 s	3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-1 ~ -1 .		10	- )	-	-	or addac	-	-		_	•
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 6		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 1		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh
				P 0									respons					
				I O		Ot1	her					9	-		5			
				? 2														

Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1123 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies	:		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		1336/1421	3.16	4.30		4.35	3.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	2	2	3	1	2		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		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		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		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		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		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		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		****/1311	****	3.58	3.85	3.96	****
o. Dia addiovidual ocominques cimanes four anacistanding	-		_	Ü	Ü	_	ŭ	2.50	, 1311		3.30	3.03	3.70	
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		****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	2	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****
0.15														
Self Paced	0.0	^		-	1	_	_	0 50	****	الدياديات الإيلان	F 00	4 24	4 60	****
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 ****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	, 10	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
<ol> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> <li>Were there enough proctors for all the students</li> </ol>	20 20	0 1	1	0	0 1	0	1	3.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	5.00	4.25 4.34	5.00 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	T	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	/ 29		5.00	4.34	5.00	

Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 54
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland S Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1123 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: LO, JAMES T

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1124 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

								eguer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did wor	, asin now	Genera insights,ski		thia gourgo	1	0	0	3	2	8	11	1 12	1077/1669	4.16	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.13
		or make clear			1	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	777/1666		4.12	4.19	4.29	4.13
		stions reflec	_	_	1	0	0	1	3	7		4.33	746/1421		4.30		4.35	4.33
	_	cions reflect	-	_	1	8	0	0	2	6		4.38	673/1617		4.09	4.15	4.24	4.38
				nat you learned	1	6	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	773/1555		3.83	4.00	3.96	4.00
	_	_		what you learned	1	8	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	390/1543		4.06	4.06	4.10	4.50
		system clearl			2	0	1	0	3	2	17	4.48	532/1647		4.21	4.12	4.19	4.48
		as class cand			1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1668		4.75	4.67	4.59	5.00
				ing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	840/1605	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.11
		Lectur	re															
1. Were th	ne instruct	or's lecture	es well pi	repared	1	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	584/1514	4.41	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.67
2. Did the	e instructo	or seem inter	ested 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 led	cture mater	rial presente	ed and exp	olained 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	e lectures	contribute t	o what yo	ou learned	1	0	1	4	2	3	14	4.04	1051/1506	4.04	4.16	4.26	4.33	4.04
5. Did aud	diovisual t	echniques en	ihance you	ır understanding	1	19	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1311	4.04	3.58	3.85	3.96	***
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	oute to wh	nat you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1490	3.45	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were al	ll students	actively en	couraged	to participate	20	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1502	3.72	3.78	4.26	4.31	****
				open discussion	20	0	1	1	0	0	3		****/1489		3.76	4.29	4.36	****
4. Were sp	pecial tech	niques succe	essful		20	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.80	3.55	4.00	3.99	****
		Labora	itory															
2. Were yo	ou provideo	d with adequa	ite backgi	cound information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.36	***
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld experie	ence contribu	ite to wha	at you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you	ı clearly ι	understand yo	ur evalua	ation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	***	5.00	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the	e instructo	or available	for consu	ıltation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what	degree co	ould you disc	uss your	evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	5.00	***
		Self	Paced															
				nat you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
3. Were yo	our contact	s with the i	nstructo:	helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	
	1	0 00 0 00																
00-27 28-55	1 5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A 11 B 11		Rec	quire	ed ic	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D 0								0			.1			1.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0 P 0		ET€	ectiv	/es				0	#### - :				_	11
				Р 0 I 0		Oth	2020				2	4	respons	es lo I	Je sign	ıııcan	ı L	
				5 0		ULI	IGI				4	I						
				. 0														

Course Section: MATH 221 0201 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI Fall 2006

Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1125

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Questions						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	769/1669	4.16	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	727/1666	4.17	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.38
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	645/1421	4.21	4.30	4.24	4.35	4.44
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	6	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	641/1617	4.28	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.40
				what you learned	0	3		0	1	4			316/1555	4.17		4.00		4.54
				o what you learned	0	3		0	1	3			290/1543				4.10	
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	0	-			481/1647				4.19	
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1668					
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1312/1605	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.15	3.60
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	647/1514					
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1				1143/1551				4.72	
				xplained clearly	0	0							996/1503				4.29	
		es contribute t		-	0	1	1	0					838/1506				4.33	
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1311	4.04	3.58	3.85	3.96	***
	Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learn																	
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn						0		5	0			1305/1490				4.11	
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	2	1				1285/1502				4.31	
3. Did th	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1310/1489	3.66	3.76	4.29	4.36	3.43
		Semina																
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.20	4.38	4.59	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 1	 A 7		Per			or Ma			n	Graduate		0	Majo		2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		1/6/	40TI	Lu I	J_ 1410	בטנ ג	D	U	Graduate	•	U	Ma J	) <u>+</u>	4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nerai	1				0	Under-gr	ad 1	6	Non-	-major	14
84-150							c. a.	-					onaci -gi	1	. •	14011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E14	ecti	ves.				4	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Ji da.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0								-	response				_	
				I O		O+1	ner				1	.2	_ coponec		,c 5191.	cai		
				? 0		0.01					_	-						
		• •																

INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Questions

Title Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 28

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1126 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

		General																
		w insights,skills fr		1	0	2	0	3	9	13	4.15	1052/	1669	4.16	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.15
		tor make clear the e	_	1	0	0	2	6	11	8	3.93	1206/	1666	4.17	4.16	4.19	4.29	3.93
	_	estions reflect the	-	1	0	0	2	6	8	11	4.04	957/	1421	4.21	4.30	4.24	4.35	4.04
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect the e	xpected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	790/	1617	4.28	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.26
5. Did as	signed re	adings 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 wr	itten ass	ignments 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 th	e grading	system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	1	5	12	9	4.07	1007/	1647	4.29	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.07
8. How ma	ny 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 wo	uld you g	rade the overall tea	ching 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 t	he instru	ctor'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
		tor seem interested		1	0	0	1	1	6			1119/		4.67		4.66	4.72	4.59
		erial presented and		1	0	1	1	8				1176/		4.00		4.24		3.89
		s contribute to what	-	1	0	0	5	3	7			1111/			4.16			
		techniques enhance		1	3	1	1	5							3.58			
J. Did ad	aiovisuai	teciniiques emiance	your understanding		5			J	O	11	1.01	3077	1311	1.01	3.30	3.03	3.90	1.01
1 544		Discussion		1.0	0	1	0	_	1	2	2 50	11547	1400	2 45	2 [2	4 05	1 11	2 50
		ssions contribute to	-	18	0	1	0	5	1			1154/		3.45	3.53		4.11	
		ts actively encourag		16	0	1	1	3	4			1283/		3.72	3.78	4.26	4.31	
		tor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	18	0	1	1	3	3			1318/		3.66	3.76		4.36	
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques successful		17	1	0	0	3	6	Τ	3.80	643/	T006	3.80	3.55	4.00	3.99	3.80
		Laboratory																
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequate bac	kground information	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	233	****	3.56	4.19	4.36	****
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant to th	e announced theme	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	112	****	4.20	4.38	4.59	****
		Field Work																
1 Did fi	eld evner	ience contribute to	what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	Λ	1.00	****/	58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	****
	_	understand your eva	_	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	****
		tor available for co		27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****
3. Was CII	e Ilistiuc	cor available for co	iisuicacioii	27	U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	, , ,	33		3.00	4.33	5.00	
		Self Paced			_			_	_									
	_	system contribute to	_	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clear the	expected goal	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re:	ason	s				Тур	e.			Majors	<b>:</b>
														·				, 
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Grad	duate	2	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	В 9															
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 2	C 8		Ger	nera	1				0	Und	er-gr	ad 2	28	Non-	major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 1															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	###	# - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
			P 0									res	ponse	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0		Oth	ner				2	5							
			? 0															

Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR

Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 23

Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1127 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skill	ls from	m this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	1173/1669	4.16	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.00
		ctor make clear t			0	0	1	0	5	8	9		1071/1666		4.16	4.19	4.29	4.04
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	954/1421	4.21	4.30	4.24	4.35	4.04
	_	uations reflect t		_	0	7	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	993/1617	4.28	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.06
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribut	te to i	what you learned	1	2	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	773/1555	4.17	3.83	4.00	3.96	4.00
5. Did wr	itten ass	signments contrib	bute 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
. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	expla:	ined	1	0	0	2	2	10	8	4.09	997/1647	4.29	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.09
B. How ma	ny times	was class cancel	lled		1	0	0	0	0	19	3	4.14	1457/1668	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.59	4.14
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teach	ning 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 t	he instru	uctor's lectures	well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	10	8	5	3.78	1313/1514	4.41	4.39	4.39	4.39	3.78
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interes	sted in	n 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 le	cture mat	terial presented	and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	1	1	8	5	8	3.78	1220/1503	4.00	4.03	4.24	4.29	3.78
. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	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 au	diovisua	l techniques enha	ance y	our understanding	2	16	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/1311	4.04	3.58	3.85	3.96	***
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne					0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1062/1490	3.45	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.71
2. Were a	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
B. Did th	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
l. Were s	special to	echniques success	sful		16	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1006	3.80	3.55	4.00	3.99	***
		Laborato	ory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequate	e backs	ground information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.36	***
		Field Wo	ork															
l. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute	e to wh	nat you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	***
		y understand you			22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	***
		Self Pa	aced															
l. Did se	elf-paced	system contribut	te to v	what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	***
2. Did st	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned Did study questions make clear the expected goal					0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****
	F						trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
 00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A 7		Red	 quir	 ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 8	Required for Majo											3 -		
56-83 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 5 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 4						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	major	21

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course Section: MATH 225 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT Fall 2006

Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 27

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1128

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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		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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1		12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				2	2						

Course Section: MATH 225 0201 University of Maryland Page 1129 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Instructor: BELL, JOHN D

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 20

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

5

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	4	6	7	3	3.45	1489/1666	4.13	4.16	4.19	4.29	3.45
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	1	1	7	9	1	3.42	1414/1617	3.72	4.09	4.15	4.24	3.42
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	oute 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 wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute t	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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	5	12	2	3.75	1275/1647	4.20	4.21	4.12	4.19	3.75
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1125/1668	4.87	4.75	4.67	4.59	4.60
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	12	2	1	2.89	1527/1605	3.70	3.87	4.07	4.15	2.89
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	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						0	0	0	8	11		1135/1551	4.75	4.62	4.66	4.72	4.58
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearl</li> </ol>						0	4	7	5	2		1390/1503	4.09	4.03	4.24	4.29	3.28
		es contribute t			2 1	0	4	1	7	5	2		1403/1506	4.07	4.16	4.26	4.33	3.00
				our understanding	1	17	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1311	3.16	3.58	3.85	3.96	***
		Discus	ad on															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	Λ	2 67	****/1490	3.76	3 53	4.05	4.11	****
				ed to participate	16	0	1	1	0	2	0		****/1502			4.26	4.31	****
		-	_	nd open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	1	-		****/1489			4.29		****
				_														
	Fr							utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	`	2	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 9	Required for Majo													
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 7	Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	major	18	

Electives

Other

0

16

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

1

0

D

F

Ρ

I

Course Section: MATH 225 0301 University of Maryland Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: MINKOFF, SUSAN Enrollment: 38

Questionnaires: 28

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1130

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	2.4	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		4.16	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		3.78	4.26	4.31	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	3	3		1038/1489	3.79	3.76	4.29	4.36	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	21	5	0	0	1	1	0		****/1006		3.55	4.00	3.99	****
				3	_	_	Ū	2.50	, 1000			00		
Laboratory														

#### Frequency Distribution

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	27	-			
				2	0						

Course Section: MATH 251 0101 University of Maryland Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS Baltimore County

MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS Baltimore County SEIDMAN, THOMAS Fall 2006

Instructor: SEII Enrollment: 64

Questionnaires: 21

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

6

F

Р

I

?

0

1

0

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1131 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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 0 1 5 6 9 4.10 997/1647 4.03 4.21 4.12 4.19 4.10					eque					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
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 3.50 dthe 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 3.50 dthe 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	General														
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 4.14 5. 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 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 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 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 ***** 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 17 0 1 0 2 1 0 2.75 ****/1490 **** 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 **** 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 ****		0	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1288/1669	3.60	4.12	4.23	4.34	3.90
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 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 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0		0	0	1	5	1	9	5						4.29	3.57
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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	• •	0	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	831/1421	3.60	4.30	4.24	4.35	4.24
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 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 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. 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
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 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  Discussion  Discussion  Discussions  Discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/1490 **** 3.53 4.05 4.11 ****  Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 1 0 2 1 0 2.75 ****/1489 **** 3.76 4.29 4.36 ****  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 ****	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
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 ****	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	ed 0	10	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	638/1543	3.77	4.06	4.06	4.10	4.27
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor seeminterested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what y	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
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. O 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  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  6. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  9. Discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1.	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
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 ****	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	ss 3	1	1	4	4	5	3	3.29	1443/1605	3.02	3.87	4.07	4.15	3.29
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 ****															
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 ****															
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 ****		1				4	6	7							
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 ****		-	-	_		3	_			- ,					
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 ****															
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 ****	-	-	-	_	_	-	-								
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 ****	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	g 0	15	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1227/1311	2.87	3.58	3.85	3.96	2.50
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 ****	Diamondan														
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 ****		17	0	Λ	Λ	2	1	1	2 75	****/1/00	****	2 52	4 05	1 11	****
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 ****						2	1	Λ							
**			-		-	2	_	-		,					
1. Wele special techniques successful	3 1				-	_	•	_							
	4. Were special techniques successivi	10	5	_	U	U		U	2.50	/1000		3.33	1.00	3.99	
Field Work	Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.20 ****		20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	***
	•														
Frequency Distribution	Fre	equency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Earned Cum GDA Expected Grade	25			Re:	agons	=			Tv	ne			Maiors	
							, 								
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 2	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	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			Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	19
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														

Electives

Other

0

19

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course Section: MATH 251 0201 University of Maryland MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS Baltimore County

Page 1132 Title JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	25

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

					Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	3	7	14	4.32	828/1669	3.60	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.32
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	3	3	4	14	4.21	949/1666	3.39	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.21
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	2	0	4	8	11	4.04	954/1421	3.60	4.30	4.24	4.35	4.04
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	14	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	568/1617	3.70	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.45
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	4	2	18	4.48	515/1647	4.03	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.48
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1668	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	6	12	5	3.83	1148/1605	3.02	3.87	4.07	4.15	3.83
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s 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 th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	1045/1503	3.21	4.03	4.24	4.29	4.04
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	6	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	531/1311	2.87	3.58	3.85	3.96	4.12
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
				d to participate	21	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1502	****	3.78	4.26	4.31	****
		_		d open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1489		3.76	4.29	4.36	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	3.99	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 00-27					Red	 quir	ed f	 or M	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		2
28-55						100	~1u11	ca I	O 1 1·1	<u>ـ ۲</u>	~	•	Gradade	_	•	11000	-	-
56-83					Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	23	
84-150					001	c. a.	-				•	onacr 9			1,011		23	
Grad.					Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enouc	ιh	
2200.	Ü	3.30 1.00	•	P 0		Electives				<pre>2 #### - Means there are not enough     responses to be significant</pre>			,					
				I 0	Other 21													
1 0				- 0		Other					21							

Course Section: MATH 251 0301 University of Maryland Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1133

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quarties.							Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	6	4	7	1	3	2.57	1639/1669	3.60	4.12	4.23	4.34	2.57
		ctor make clear			0	0	7	4	6	3	1	2.38	1643/1666	3.39	4.16	4.19	4.29	2.38
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	7	4	4	2	3	1	2.50	1591/1617	3.70	4.09	4.15	4.24	2.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	4	1	3	6	7	3.52	1385/1647	4.03	4.21	4.12	4.19	3.52
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	15	6	4.29	1364/1668		4.75	4.67	4.59	4.29
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	6	5	5	0	0	1.94	1592/1605	3.02	3.87	4.07	4.15	1.94
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s 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 th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	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 le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	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 th	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	8	4	4	2	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.87	3.58	3.85	3.96	2.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	16	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	16	0	4	0	1	0	0	1.40	****/1502	****	3.78	4.26	4.31	****
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	16	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	****/1489	****	3.76	4.29	4.36	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		16	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	3.99	****
		Labora	torv															
2. Were y	ou provid		-	kground information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	***	3.56	4.19	4.36	****
				Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trib	ut i o	n									
								u010.										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajors	3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83						Ge:	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	21
84-150																		
Grad.					Electives					0			#### - Means there are not enor			_	ιh	
	P 0									responses to be significant			ıt					
				I 0		Ot:	her		14		.4							
				? 1														

Course Section: MATH 251H 0101 University of Maryland
Title Baltimore County
Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN Fall 2006

?

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

17

University of Maryland Page 1134
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Frequencies

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

0						T. T.	-quc	ITCICL	,		TILD	LIUCCOI	COULDO	. DCPC	OLIDC	псуст	DCCC	
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1												,			
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	199/1669	4.81	4.12	4.23	4.34	4.81
_	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	,	4.47		4.19	4.29	4.47
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	3		4.56	502/1421		4.30			
	_	ations reflect		_	0	5	0	1	2	4	4		1029/1617	4.00	4.09	4.15	4.24	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	676/1555	4.13	3.83	4.00	3.96	4.13
				o what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	3		4.44		4.44	4.06	4.06		4.44
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	977/1647	4.13	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.13
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668		4.75			5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	328/1605		3.87		4.15	4.56
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	342/1514	4.81	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.81
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.62	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained 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	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 aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					7	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.58	3.85	3.96	3.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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
				d 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	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	4	9	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	3.99	***
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.36	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credita F:	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Pe:	asons	2			Тут	20			Majors	2
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad									, 				,c 				, 
00-27						Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	8
28-55																		
56-83					Ge:	nera:	1				0	Under-gr	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	8	
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives				1 #### - Means there are not enough			јh						
	P 0								responses to be significant									
	I 0					Other 15												

Course Section: MATH 301 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1135 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions								_	ncies				tructor		_		Level	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1064/1669	4.04	4.12	4.23	4.28	4.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	7			1094/1666		4.16	4.19	4.20	4.00
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	746/1421		4.30	4.24	4.25	4.33
	_	uations reflect			0	5	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.01	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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
				o 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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	3	4	5	3	3.53	1381/1647	3.57	4.21	4.12	4.14	3.53
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.95	4.75	4.67	4.68	4.93
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1225/1605	3.97	3.87	4.07	4.09	3.73
		Lectur	_															
1 Were t	he inctri			prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4 27	1076/1514	4.48	4.39	4.39	4 46	4.27
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared wid the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	0	1	13		917/1551		4.62	4.66		4.73
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	4	5				1401/1503		4.03	4.24		3.20
		es contribute t			0	0	1	2		4			1374/1506			4.26	4.30	
				your understanding	0	9	1		0	0			744/1311					
		-	-	3														
		Discus																
				what you learned	9	0	0	2	3	1			1391/1490		3.53		4.11	
		_	_	d to participate	9	0	2	3	0	1			1495/1502			4.26	4.28	2.00
				d open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	2			1379/1489		3.76	4.29	4.35	3.17
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	sstul		9	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
														- 				
00-27						Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	7
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	8
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -				_	ſh
	P 1												respons	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

9

I

0

3

Course Section: MATH 301 0201 Title

INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 12 Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1136 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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			1220/1666			4.19	4.20	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6			969/1421		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		4.09	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	****
From	onat	. Dia	+ r i b	1+ 10	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	0							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant		
				I	0	Other	10	-				
				- 2	7							

Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I

Instructor: HORTA, ARNALDO

Fall 2006

Page 1137 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	35
Ouestionnaires:	24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

						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	,	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									

Credits	dits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	10
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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	6						

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

Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II Baltimore Count Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH Fall 2006

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1138

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			3		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		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														
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														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	Λ	0	1	1	Λ	3 50	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1502	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1489		3.76	4.29	4.35	****
1 and open discussion		-	•	-	-	•	_	3.00	, = 100		3		1.00	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expected	l 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	nificant		
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

#### Course Section: MATH 381 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County LIN. METH/OPER RESEARC

Fall 2006

Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 17

Ctudent	Cource	Evaluation	Ougetic	nnaire

Page 1139

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	,skills from this course			0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	clear the expected goals			0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	591/1666	4.47	4.16	4.19	4.20	4.47
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	tions reflect the expected goals				1	0	0	1	15	4.71	344/1421	4.71	4.30	4.24	4.25	4.71
4. Did 0	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.40
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 v	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 t	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.40
	-	was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	9	7		1248/1668	4.44	4.75	4.67	4.68	4.44
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	654/1605	4.29	3.87	4.07	4.09	4.29
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 t	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					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 a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	9	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	****	3.58	3.85	3.97	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did 0	class disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 t	echniques succe	ssful		11	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	4.10	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;		Type					Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 15		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	6
28-55 56-83	1 2	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B 1 C 0		Cox	nera:	1				6	IIndor ~	rad 1	.7	Mos	maiom	11
84-150		3.00-2.99	3	D 0		Ger	iera.	т				U	Under-g	rau I	. /	MOI1-	-major	ТТ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		רק.	20+17	700				0 #### - Means there ar				re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	7	P 0		Electives						U	#### - Means there are no responses to be significated.				_	111
P U				P 0								_	responses to be significant					

Other

9

I

?

0

#### Course Section: MATH 401 0101 University of Maryland Title MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1140

			Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	Λ						

Course Section: MATH 404 0101

INTRO PART DIFF EQ I

Title Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 21 Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1141 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
1 Did vou	a dain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	3	5	7	6	3 76	1367/1669	3.76	4.12	4.23	4.39	3.76
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	7	7	6		1273/1666		4.12	4.19	4.22	3.86
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	1	6	10	3		1135/1421		4.30	4.24	4.38	3.75
	_	uations reflect			1	3	1	0	7	7	2		1364/1617		4.09	4.15	4.22	3.53
				what you learned	0	1	2	4	3	6	5		1303/1555		3.83	4.00	4.08	3.40
	_	_		o what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	4	7		1035/1543		4.06	4.06	4.18	3.8
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	2	1	8	10	4.24			4.21	4.12	4.14	4.2
	_	was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	12	8		1274/1668		4.75	4.67	4.70	4.4
	-			ching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	7	5	2		1412/1605		3.87		4.16	3.3
		Lectur	re															
L. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	923/1514	4.42	4.39	4.39	4.45	4.4
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.62	4.66	4.73	4.6
3. Was lec	ture ma	terial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	5	6	3.68	1269/1503	3.68	4.03	4.24	4.27	3.6
1. Did the	lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1025/1506	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.1
Did aud	liovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	2.80	1186/1311	2.80	3.58	3.85	3.88	2.8
	Discussion Oid class discussions contribute to what you learn																	
	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	2.9
	Tere all students actively encouraged to participate				9	0	1	2	6	2	1		1395/1502		3.78	4.26	4.46	3.0
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			nd open discussion	10	0	2	2	3	1	3		1393/1489		3.76	4.29	4.52	3.0
1. Were sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio Were special techniques successful				11	7	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	4.21	***
		Field					_	_										
	_			hat you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 58		5.00	4.22	3.94	***
_				uation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52		5.00	4.06	3.80	***
		ctor available			20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39		5.00	4.39	3.78	
. To what	degree	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluatıons	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	3.81	***
. 5:41	£	Self			20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/	****	г оо	1 21	г оо	***
		tions make clea		what you learned	20 19	0 1	0	0	0 1	0	0		****/ 55 ****/ 42		5.00	4.34	5.00	***
				_	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46		5.00	4.45	4.92	***
_	. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful . Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			-	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33		5.00	4.45	3.00	***
	F					Dist	trib	utio	n									
Tredita Fa	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re:	ason	a a			ጥኒን	ре			Majors	•
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 5 B 9		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	9	Majo	or	7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	c_ u	_				_	JG. 9	1	-	1,011		- 1
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh

Other

14

Ρ

I

?

0

0

2

Course Section: MATH 407 0101 University of Maryland Page 1142 Title MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: TOLL, CHARLES

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	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	4.19	4.38	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	2	<i>5</i>	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		4	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	390/1533		4.06	4.06	4.18	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.00	4.12	4.10	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.21	4.12	4.14	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	1	15 7	4.25	690/1605	4.25	3.87	4.67		4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	U	U	4	Т	/	4.25	090/1005	4.25	3.87	4.07	4.10	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		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		4.16	4.26	4.29	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	0	1	0		****/1311		3.58	3.85	3.88	****
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	11	U	U	U		U	1.00	/1311		3.30	3.03	3.00	
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
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 a	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

#### Course Section: MATH 410 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO COMPLEX ANALYSIS Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1143

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	Ο	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
	Ü	Ü	,	,	,	_			,	50	2.70	27	52	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: MATH 421 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTION TO TOPOLO

Baltimore County Fall 2006

SEIDMAN, THOMAS Instructor: Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 6

Page 1144 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions				Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
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 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	General														
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 4.25 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 1 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 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 2 3.317 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 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1		0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.12	4.23	4.39	4.33
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 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 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 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 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 1 5 4.83 705/1551 4.83 4.62 4.66 4.73 4.83 3.83 1.83 1.84 1.84 1.84 1.84 1.85 1.85 1.85 1.85 1.85 1.85 1.85 1.85	1 9 ,	•	•	0	1	3	0	2		,					
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 0 1 5 4.83 705/1551 4.83 4.62 4.66 4.73 4.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1311 **** 3.58 3.85 3.88 ****  Discussion				-	0	-	0	4		,					
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 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 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 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 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1311 **** 3.58 3.85 3.88 ****  Discussion		0	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20					4.22	
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 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 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 0 1 5 4.83 705/1551 4.83 4.62 4.66 4.73 3.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1311 **** 3.58 3.85 3.88 ****  Discussion	<u>.</u> 3	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	3.83	4.00	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 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 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 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	-	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.06		4.18	4.20
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 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 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 3.88 ****  Discussion	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
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion  Lecture  0. 0. 0. 1. 3. 0. 2. 3.50 1389/1514  3.50. 4.39. 4.39. 4.45  3.50. 2. 3.50  3. 4. 30. 2. 3.50  3. 4. 83. 4. 83. 4. 83  4. 83. 4. 83. 4. 83  4. 83. 4. 83. 4. 83  4. 980/1506  4. 17. 4. 16. 4. 26. 4. 29. 4. 17  4. 83. 4. 83  4. 83. 83. 84. 84. 84. 84. 84. 84. 84. 84. 84. 84	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
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 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 3.88 ****  Discussion	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
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 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 3.88 ****  Discussion															
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		•			_	_	•	_							
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		0	-	0	1	3	0	_		, -					
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	g · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	-	-	-	1	5		,					
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	2		. ,					
Discussion	-	-	0	0	0	_	1	3							
	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	Ο	1	5 00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1502 **** 3.78 4.26 4.46 ****			-	-	0	-	0	1		,					****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1489 **** 3.76 4.29 4.52 ****			-	-	-	-	0	1		,					****
	1. III III III IIII IIII IIII IIII IIII		ŭ	,	,	,	,	_	2.00	, 1100				52	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: MATH 426 0101 University of Maryland Title INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB Baltimore County

INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB Baltimore County MUSCEDERE, MICH Fall 2006

Enrollment: 16
Ouestionnaires: 11

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 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 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 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 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 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 4.40Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω 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 2 2 7 4.45 706/1506 4.45 4.16 4.26 4.29 4.45 0 0 0 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 2 742/1490 4.20 3.53 4.05 4.26 4.20 0 3 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 00 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 9 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 226 **** 5.00 4.20 4.61 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 233 **** 3.56 4.19 4.40 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 Ω 9 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** 5.00 4.50 4.39 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 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

Page 1145

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		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 a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	2						

Course Section: MATH 430 0101

Title MATRIX ANALYSIS

Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1146 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	342/1514		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			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	1.0	0	0	0	-	_	-	4 00	0.40 / 1.400	4 00	2 52	4 05	4 06	4 00
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		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		****/ 225	****	5.00	4.19	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 206	****	5.00	4.35	4.20	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	13		U	U	U	_	U	1.00	/ 200		3.00	1.13	1.20	
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	****
0.10 - 1														
Self Paced	1 -	^	0	0	0	-	-	4 50	****	المناسية	F 00	4 2 4	F 00	4.4.4.4.
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 55	***	5.00	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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 1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	Τ	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 29		5.00	4.34	2.00	

Course Section: MATH 430 0101 Title MATRIX ANALYSIS Instructor:

ZWECK, JOHN

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 17

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1146 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		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 a	are not enougl	h
				P	1			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	3						

Course Section: MATH 441 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS Baltimore County
Instructor: STAFF Fall 2006

Instructor: STAFF
Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1147

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills 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	Ω	Λ	Λ	1	Ω	Λ	3 00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1502		3.78	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1489	****	3.76	4.29	4.52	****

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course Section: MATH 475 0101 University of Maryland Title COMBINATORICS/GRAPH TH Baltimore County

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

Enrollment: 9 Ouestionnaires: 7

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 1148

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 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 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 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 5 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1301/1502 3.50 3.78 4.26 4.46 3.50

#### Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1489 **** 3.76 4.29 4.52 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	1						

Course Section: MATH 479 0101

MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S

Title ARMSTRONG, THOM

Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1149 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Ο	0	1	Λ	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		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		4.39	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		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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Baltimore County

Course Section: MATH 601 0101

15

MEASURE THEORY

GOWDA, MUDDAPPA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Page 1150 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eanei	ncies	:		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.12	4.23	4.35	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.16	4.19	4.19	4.83
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1421	4.92	4.30	4.24	4.33	4.92
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.09	4.15	4.24	5.00
				what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.00
				o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	104/1543	4.91	4.06	4.06	4.27	4.91
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.21	4.12	4.15	4.75
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	135/1605	4.82	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.82
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lectures	s 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	old the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear:						0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.62	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.03	4.24	4.22	4.75		
		you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.16	4.26	4.24	5.00		
. Did aud	diovisua	our understanding	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.58	3.85	3.89	****		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 al	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d 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	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		6	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	4.11	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	4.47	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequat	te back	ground information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.56	4.19	4.41	****
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avail	lable f	or lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****
		structor provide			11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	5.00	4.15	4.39	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
 00-27	A 6					or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		4	Majo		 8			
28-55	2 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	В 3		11.01	4u11	cu I	J. 1·10	. ,	5	•	Graduat	_	-	1.100 ) (	-	0
56-83						Gei	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad	8	Non-	-major	4
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 D 0															-		5	-
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0			L					0	respons	es to k	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					9						

?

0

Course Section: MATH 620 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title NUMERICAL ANALYSIS I MINKOFF, SUSAN Fall 2006 Instructor:

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 9

Page 1151 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 225 **** 5.00 4.50 4.65 ****

0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 223 **** 5.00 4.35 4.48 ****

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 **** 5.00 4.15 4.39 ****

													_	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				-	ncie	S			ructor	Course	-		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		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		4.03	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		4.16	4.26		4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	875/1311		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		3.53	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		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		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	****

#### Frequency Distribution

8 0 0

8 0 0

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

Course Section: MATH 627 0101 University of Maryland INTR PARALLEL COMP Baltimore County GOBBERT, MATTHI Fall 2006

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

6

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.03	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
Prince and an														
Discussion	4	0	^	^	0	^	_	F 00	1 /1 400	F 00	2 52	4 05	4 10	F 00
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	1	∠ 1	5.00	1/1502		3.78	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	U	U	U	U	Τ	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.44	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1152

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	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	В	0	•					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		Under-grad	3	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0	General					
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course Section: MATH 635 0101 University of Mary:
Title FINITE ELEMENTS Baltimore County
Instructor: SURI, MANIL Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

8

University of Maryland Page 1153
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

							Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	ept UMBC Level		Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	769/1669	9 4.38	4.12	4.23	4.35	4.38
		ructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	2	1	5	4.38	727/166		4.16	4.19	4.19	4.38
		estions reflect			0	0 0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	710/142		4.30	4.24	4.33	4.38
	_	ations reflect			0	0	1	0	2	3	2		1323/161		4.09	4.15	4.24	3.63
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	963/155		3.83	4.00	4.07	3.88
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	180/1543		4.06	4.06	4.27	4.75
		signments contri s system clearly			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	345/164		4.21	4.12	4.15	4.63
		was class cance	_	ainea	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668		4.75	4.67	4.83	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/160			4.07		4.57
9. HOW WO	ouia you g	grade the overa.	II tead	ching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	3	4	4.5/	320/100:	9 4.57	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.5/
		Lecture	_															
		actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	441/151		4.39	4.39	4.37	4.75
		ctor seem intere		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/155		4.62	4.66	4.72	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	753/1503	3 4.38	4.03	4.24	4.22	4.38
		es contribute to			0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	909/150	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	****/1313	L ****	3.58	3.85	3.89	****
		Discus	sion															
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 a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed 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 th	e instruc	ctor encourage i	fair ar	nd open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1468/1489	2.50	3.76	4.29	4.44	2.50
		echniques succes		-	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.55	4.00	4.11	****
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced			what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 5!	****	5.00	4.34	4.45	****
		ions make clear			7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42		5.00	4.31	4.40	****
		acts with the in			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40		5.00	4.45	4.61	****
		ck/tutoring by R			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3:		5.00	4.25	4.60	****
		igh proctors for		-	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	-	5.00	4.34	5.00	****
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	า									
				11040	.01107	212	0112											
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			T;	/pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	:e	4	Majo	or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				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		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	ses to l	oe sign	nificar	ıt		

Other

I

?

0

0

Course Section: MATH 651 0101

Title OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM

Instructor: GULER, OSMAN

Enrollment:

7 Questionnaires: 4

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1154 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect				
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
x														
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		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		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		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
- 1														
Laboratory	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	1 / 226	F 00	F 00	4 00	4 45	F 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0		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		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		5.00	1/ 225	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.65	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 223 1/ 206	5.00 5.00	5.00	4.35 4.15	4.48 4.39	5.00 5.00
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	3	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 200	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		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		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		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

Course Section: MATH 651 0101

Title OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM

Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 4

Baltimore County GULER, OSMAN Fall 2006

Page 1154 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	are not enough	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

#### Course Section: MATH 750 0101 University of Maryland INTERDISCIPLI CONSULTI Baltimore County

Page 1155 Title JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	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				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	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						