```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0101               University of Maryland                                    Page  942
Title           INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH         Baltimore County                                        JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     GAVREA, BOGDAN                Spring 2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      52
Questionnaires:  32                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  2  2  7 11 10  3.78 1236/1481  3.73  4.23  4.29 4.14  3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  1  7  6 17  4.16  917/1481  4.04  4.17  4.23 4.18  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  3  4  7 17  4.23  765/1249  4.07  4.39  4.27 4.14  4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  14  0  1  7  3  7  3.89 1101/1424  3.92  4.14  4.21 4.06  3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  1  0  5 10  8  4.00  707/1396  3.59  3.83  3.98 3.89  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 23  1  0  3  2  3  3.67 1039/1342  3.60  4.07  4.07 3.88  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  4  6 20  4.34  683/1459  4.09  4.28  4.16 4.17  4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  1  5 25  4.77  863/1480  4.53  4.83  4.68 4.64  4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  1  0  8 17  2  3.68 1156/1450  3.31  4.03  4.09 3.97  3.68

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0  5  4 20  4.52  750/1409  3.90  4.40  4.42 4.36  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  2  6  6 15  4.17 1281/1407  4.29  4.70  4.69 4.57  4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  1  0  3 12 13  4.24  837/1399  3.84  4.05  4.26 4.23  4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   1  1  1  3  8 15  4.25  867/1400  4.02  4.18  4.27 4.19  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 18  1  0  2  2  6  4.09  560/1179  3.49  3.69  3.96 3.85  4.09

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0  4  1  2  2  6  3.33 1059/1262  3.49  3.20  4.05 3.77  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  1  2  3  3  5  3.64 1071/1259  3.73  3.65  4.29 4.06  3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0  1  1  4  3  5  3.71 1055/1256  3.77  3.64  4.30 4.08  3.71
4. Were special techniques successful                   18  7  1  1  1  1  3  3.57 ****/ 788  3.67  3.41  4.00 3.80  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   29  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20 3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11 3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40 4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            30  0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20 4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  30  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04 4.02  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49 4.54  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  69  ****  4.38  4.53 4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  63  ****  4.25  4.44 4.17  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  69  ****  4.25  4.35 4.14  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  68  ****  2.38  3.92 3.80  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30 4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00 3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60 5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26 ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42 ****  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55 4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     31  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75 4.42  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65 4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        31  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83 4.67  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0201            University of Maryland                              Page  943
Title           INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH        Baltimore County                                 JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     JONES CRISTEN                   Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires:  25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
        Questions                          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  4  5  7  8  3.68 1291/1481  3.73  4.23  4.29  4.14  3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  2  4  9  9  3.92 1094/1481  4.04  4.17  4.23  4.18  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  3  0  2 11  9  3.92  962/1249  4.07  4.39  4.27  4.14  3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  3  1  0  6  7  8  3.95 1023/1424  3.92  4.14  4.21  4.06  3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2  2  6  7  2  6  3.17 1234/1396  3.59  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 3 1 5 3 7  3.53 1106/1342  3.60  4.07  4.07  3.88  3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  2  1  5  8  9  3.84 1094/1459  4.09  4.28  4.16  4.17  3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  2 13  9  4.29 1185/1480  4.53  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 2 4 4 7 0  2.94 1373/1450  3.31  4.03  4.09  3.97  2.94

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  5  4  4  3  9  3.28 1334/1409  3.90  4.40  4.42  4.36  3.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2 11 12  4.40 1184/1407  4.29  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 3 1 10 4 7  3.44 1250/1399  3.84  4.05  4.26  4.23  3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  1  2  1  4 10  7  3.79 1125/1400  4.02  4.18  4.27  4.19  3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 7 0 4 4 4  2.89 1088/1179  3.49  3.69  3.96  3.85  2.89

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 3 0 2 7 5  3.65  940/1262  3.49  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 1 6 5 5  3.82 1017/1259  3.73  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 1 7 3 6  3.82 1016/1256  3.77  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  1  1  2  3  4  5  3.67  564/ 788  3.67  3.41  4.00  3.80  3.67

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  21  3  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 0 0 0 3  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 2 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           22  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.20  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 2 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  4.54  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 1 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.38  4.53  4.18  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  69  ****  4.25  4.35  4.14  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  2.38  3.92  3.80  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  ****  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.48  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.63  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0201                    University of Maryland                           Page  943
Title          INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH               Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    JONES CRISTEN                          Spring 2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 25                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades              Reasons                Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4        0.00-0.99   0       A   8        Required for Majors  18      Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0       B   6
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99   5       C   8        General               1      Under-grad  25      Non-major  25
 84-150    8        3.00-3.49   4       D   0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2       F   0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                 4
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  944
Title       ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC          Baltimore County                                   JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL              Spring 2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       97
Questionnaires: 33                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	3	9	14	3.91	1162/1481	4.20	4.23	4.29	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	1	6	20	4.35	715/1481	4.60	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	5	21	4.31	695/1249	4.58	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	840/1424	4.39	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	1011/1396	3.92	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1039/1342	4.17	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	23	4.44	565/1459	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	30	4.88	743/1480	4.91	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	741/1450	4.32	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	7	19	4.45	839/1409	4.71	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	899/1407	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	3	7	14	4.04	991/1399	4.43	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	3	5	16	4.14	953/1400	4.45	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	23	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/1179	4.17	3.69	3.96	3.85	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	2	1	9	4	3.35	1052/1262	3.83	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	3	3	4	10	4.05	881/1259	4.24	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	2	3	5	6	3.35	1131/1256	3.89	3.64	4.30	4.08	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	13	16	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	3	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0301            University of Maryland                                    Page  945
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC         Baltimore County                                         JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   RILEY, SAMANTHA             Spring 2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     65
Questionnaires:  33                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	6	22	4.50	549/1481	4.20	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	155/1481	4.60	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	28	4.84	184/1249	4.58	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	326/1424	4.39	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	1	3	2	12	4.21	536/1396	3.92	3.83	3.98	3.89	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	190/1342	4.17	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	175/1459	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	491/1480	4.91	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	0	8	15	4.50	334/1450	4.32	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	75/1409	4.71	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	200/1407	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	195/1399	4.43	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	24	4.75	312/1400	4.45	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	15	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	510/1179	4.17	3.69	3.96	3.85	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	527/1262	3.83	3.20	4.05	3.77	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	0	4	13	4.42	661/1259	4.24	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	658/1256	3.89	3.64	4.30	4.08	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	13	12	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.80	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.38	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.25	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.25	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.38	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0301          University of Maryland                    Page  945
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                     JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   RILEY, SAMANTHA                  Spring 2006                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    65
Questionnaires: 33              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    12       0.00-0.99   0      A   14        Required for Majors  17    Graduate    0      Major       0
 28-55     4       1.00-1.99   0      B   11
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99   5      C    6        General               1    Under-grad  33     Non-major   33
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49   4      D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   7      F    0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other                 9
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 115  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  946
Title       FINITE MATHEMATICS            Baltimore County                              JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  GURTUNA, FILIZ                  Spring 2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     41
Questionnaires: 14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                     Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     2   0   0   0   3   4   5  4.17   947/1481  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      2   0   1   0   2   4   5  4.00  1000/1481  4.00  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     2   0   1   0   1   4   6  4.17   810/1249  4.17  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      2   7   1   0   0   2   2  3.80  1160/1424  3.80  4.14  4.21  4.06  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  3   1   3   1   1   3   2  3.00  1292/1396  3.00  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4  5   2   0   1   1   1  2.80  1318/1342  2.80  4.07  4.07  3.88  2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              3   0   0   0   4   1   6  4.18   836/1459  4.18  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                    4   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00     1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0   0   2   4   4   1  3.36  1277/1450  3.36  4.03  4.09  3.97  3.36

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          3   0   1   1   1   0   8  4.18  1074/1409  4.18  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     3   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.57  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4   0   1   1   2   2   4  3.70  1182/1399  3.70  4.05  4.26  4.23  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       3   0   1   0   2   1   7  4.18   921/1400  4.18  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3   6   0   0   2   1   2  4.00   590/1179  4.00  3.69  3.96  3.85  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5   0   3   0   2   0   4  3.22  1087/1262  3.22  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5   0   1   0   1   2   5  4.11   861/1259  4.11  3.65  4.29  4.06  4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5   0   2   0   0   0   7  4.11   854/1256  4.11  3.64  4.30  4.08  4.11
4. Were special techniques successful                    5   8   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 132  0101          University of Maryland                        Page  947
Title        MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II        Baltimore County                         JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                   Spring 2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  2  9 4.82  225/1481  4.82 4.23  4.29 4.14 4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  115/1481  4.91 4.17  4.23 4.18 4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1249  5.00 4.39  4.27 4.14 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  5  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  165/1424  4.83 4.14  4.21 4.06 4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  0  2  4 4.67  193/1396  4.67 3.83  3.98 3.89 4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  1  0  0  0  4 4.20  592/1342  4.20 4.07  4.07 3.88 4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  101/1459  4.91 4.28  4.16 4.17 4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1480  5.00 4.83  4.68 4.64 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  3  7 4.70  196/1450  4.70 4.03  4.09 3.97 4.70

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1409  5.00 4.40  4.42 4.36 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  500/1407  4.91 4.70  4.69 4.57 4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1399  5.00 4.05  4.26 4.23 5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1400  5.00 4.18  4.27 4.19 5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  5  1  0  1  1  3 3.83  739/1179  3.83 3.69  3.96 3.85 3.83

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  138/1262  4.88 3.20  4.05 3.77 4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  238/1259  4.88 3.65  4.29 4.06 4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1256  5.00 3.64  4.30 4.08 5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  1  0  0  0  3  4 4.57  159/ 788  4.57 3.41  4.00 3.80 4.57

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0101              University of Maryland                           Page  948
Title       PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC          Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL              Spring 2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    160
Questionnaires: 66                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   6   2  17  25  14  3.61 1324/1481  3.91  4.23  4.29  4.14  3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   3   3  17  18  23  3.86 1148/1481  4.14  4.17  4.23  4.18  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   1   3  12  18  30  4.14  824/1249  4.36  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  39   2   2   8   6   7  3.56 1255/1424  3.98  4.14  4.21  4.06  3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  23   3   5  13  12   7  3.38 1149/1396  3.58  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 40   2   4   6   5   7  3.46 1140/1342  3.78  4.07  4.07  3.88  3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   3   3   7  12  39  4.27  766/1459  4.38  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   1   1   0   1   1  60  4.89  729/1480  4.88  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 20 0  2   2  15  24   3  3.52 1216/1450  3.92  4.03  4.09  3.97  3.52

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   2   1   7  20  32  4.27 1019/1409  4.44  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   1   2   4  16  39  4.45 1145/1407  4.59  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   1  11  11  25  15  3.67 1196/1399  3.98  4.05  4.26  4.23  3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   1   2   2   9  21  28  4.15  953/1400  4.33  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 27   5   4  13   4   8  3.18 1019/1179  3.48  3.69  3.96  3.85  3.18

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   5   6  13  14  22  3.70  913/1262  3.54  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   5   8  17  11  19  3.52 1092/1259  3.63  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  14   6  16  10  12  3.00 1167/1256  3.40  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   7  48   2   2   3   0   4  3.18 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  55   5   3   1   1   0   1  2.17 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 56 0  3   0   3   2   2  3.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 57 8  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           58   4   1   1   0   0   2  3.25 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 58   7   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04  4.02  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 61  3   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 62  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  63  ****  4.25  4.44  4.17  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                62   3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  2.38  3.92  3.80  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 64   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 64   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       64   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   64   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 64   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  ****  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 64  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    64   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75  4.42  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      64   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       64   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     64   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.82  4.58  ****
```

Enrollment: 160
Questionnaires: 66   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   28   0.00-0.99   3   A   14   Required for Majors 16   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   5   1.00-1.99   4   B   21
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   13   C   24   General   3   Under-grad   66   Non-major   66
 84-150   2   3.00-3.49   8   D   1
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   6   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   41
                                          ?   3

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201              University of Maryland                              Page  949
Title       PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC           Baltimore County                                   JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL               Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    198
Questionnaires: 96                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  8   0  4  3 10 24 47  4.22  896/1481  3.91  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   9   0  3  0  9 21 54  4.41  646/1481  4.14  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  8   0  0  3  8 12 65  4.58  432/1249  4.36  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   9  45  0  0  5 15 22  4.40  557/1424  3.98  4.14  4.21  4.06  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10 31  6  3 11 12 23  3.78  893/1396  3.58  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 51 0  1 11  8 17  4.11  695/1342  3.78  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           8   0  2  1  8 17 60  4.50  460/1459  4.38  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 8   0  0  0  4  3 81  4.88  743/1480  4.88  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 23 1 2 1  5 28 36 4.32  567/1450  3.92  4.03  4.09  3.97  4.32


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      13   0  0  1  6 18 58  4.60  648/1409  4.44  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14   0  1  0  5  9 67  4.72  899/1407  4.59  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0  2  3 11 19 48  4.30  783/1399  3.98  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   13   1  2  1  9 11 59  4.51  581/1400  4.33  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 21 42 5 2  4  6 16  3.79  773/1179  3.48  3.69  3.96  3.85  3.79


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25 0 14  5 17 10 25  3.38 1041/1262  3.54  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25 0  5 11 10 16 29  3.75 1046/1259  3.63  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0  6  5 15 17 29  3.81 1025/1256  3.40  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.81
4. Were special techniques successful                26  51  1  2  5  3  8  3.79 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 87 2  0  0  3  0  4  4.14 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 87 0 3 1  1  3  1  2.78 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 88 6 0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         88   3  0  0  0  1  4  4.80 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 88 7 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04  4.02  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 91 3 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  4.54  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 91 4 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  69  ****  4.38  4.53  4.18  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 91 0  2  0  2  0  1  2.60 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 91 0  1  1  1  0  2  3.20 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation     91   3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 91   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 91 4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  ****  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 91 0 1  0  1  2  1  3.40 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  91   0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75  4.42  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful    91   1  1  0  0  2  1  3.50 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful     91   1  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students   91   2  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.82  4.58  ****
```

Enrollment: 198
Questionnaires: 96   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   30   0.00-0.99   0   A   42   Required for Majors 21   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   9   1.00-1.99   2   B   21
 56-83   7   2.00-2.99   6   C   12   General   2   Under-grad 96   Non-major   96
 84-150   3   3.00-3.49 13   D   1
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00 16   F   0   Electives   3   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   49
                                        ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  950
Title         CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                                     JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   SLOWIKOWSKI, WI               Spring 2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      47
Questionnaires:  28                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  3  5 19  4.50  549/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  9 17  4.50  517/1481  4.38  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1 10 16  4.46  548/1249  4.37  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  2  3  4  8  4.06  933/1424  4.20  4.14  4.21  4.06  4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  11  0  2  2  4  9  4.18  574/1396  3.75  3.83  3.98  3.89  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10  0  1  3  6  7  4.12  683/1342  4.02  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  2  1  2 23  4.64  298/1459  4.36  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 28  5.00    1/1480  4.64  4.83  4.68  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  2 11 13  4.42  445/1450  4.18  4.03  4.09  3.97  4.42

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  5 22  4.81  319/1409  4.61  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  4 22  4.78  785/1407  4.68  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  6 19  4.63  431/1399  4.22  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  1  7 18  4.56  541/1400  4.35  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 22  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 ****/1179  3.74  3.69  3.96  3.85  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0 10  4  5  4  2  2.36 1236/1262  2.79  3.20  4.05  3.77  2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  5  8  5  4  4  2.77 1207/1259  3.31  3.65  4.29  4.06  2.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  4  4  7  6  3  3.00 1167/1256  3.36  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  21  0  2  1  0  1  3.00 ****/ 788  3.52  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24  2  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0  1  1  1  0  3.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  4.54  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0201              University of Maryland                            Page  951
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                                 JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                  Spring 2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    49
Questionnaires: 24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  2  5  8  9  4.00 1069/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29 4.14  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  4  7 12  4.35  725/1481  4.38  4.17  4.23 4.18  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  3  7 12  4.17  810/1249  4.37  4.39  4.27 4.14  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  13  0  0  0  6  4  4.40  557/1424  4.20  4.14  4.21 4.06  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  13  0  0  3  5  3  4.00  707/1396  3.75  3.83  3.98 3.89  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13 0  0  3  5  3  4.00  755/1342  4.02  4.07  4.07 3.88  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  3  8 12  4.25  775/1459  4.36  4.28  4.16 4.17  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 24  5.00    1/1480  4.64  4.83  4.68 4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  1  1  3 10  8  4.00  836/1450  4.18  4.03  4.09 3.97  4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  2  5 16  4.61  648/1409  4.61  4.40  4.42 4.36  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  2  3 18  4.70  930/1407  4.68  4.70  4.69 4.57  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  4  2  4 13  4.13  938/1399  4.22  4.05  4.26 4.23  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1  2  1  3  3 13  4.09  988/1400  4.35  4.18  4.27 4.19  4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15  2  1  1  1  3  3.25  997/1179  3.74  3.69  3.96 3.85  3.25

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  8  7  3  1  2  2.14 1242/1262  2.79  3.20  4.05 3.77  2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  5  7  5  1  3  2.52 1225/1259  3.31  3.65  4.29 4.06  2.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  7  3  5  2  4  2.67 1212/1256  3.36  3.64  4.30 4.08  2.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   3  14  2  1  3  1  0  2.43  771/ 788  3.52  3.41  4.00 3.80  2.43

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   2  2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20 3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0  3  0  1  0  0  1.50 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11 3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 2  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40 4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           20   1  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20 4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04 4.02  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22   0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30 4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  22   0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00 3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        22   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60 5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    22   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26 ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42 ****  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55 4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     22   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75 4.42  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       22   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65 4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        22   0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      22   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.82 4.58  ****

                          Frequency Distribution

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

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0301            University of Maryland                            Page  952
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  HEINZ, FEDERICO               Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      49
Questionnaires:  27                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3   0  0  0  3  6 15  4.50  549/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  4  5 14  4.43  617/1481  4.38  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0  0  0  4  8 12  4.33  679/1249  4.37  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   4  0  0  2  6 12  4.50  437/1424  4.20  4.14  4.21  4.06  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  13  0  0  2  3  6  4.36  411/1396  3.75  3.83  3.98  3.89  4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 7  0  1  4  4  7  4.06  719/1342  4.02  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  1  0  5  7 11  4.13  890/1459  4.36  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0 18  6  4.25 1215/1480  4.64  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 1  0  4  7  5  3.88  989/1450  4.18  4.03  4.09  3.97  3.88

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  2  3 19  4.71  500/1409  4.61  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  3  4 18  4.60 1031/1407  4.68  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  5  7 11  4.26  819/1399  4.22  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  0  0  3  4 16  4.57  531/1400  4.35  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 13 1  1  1  4  4  3.82  753/1179  3.74  3.69  3.96  3.85  3.82

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  2  4  3  5  5  3.37 1048/1262  2.79  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1  4  5  4  5  3.42 1120/1259  3.31  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  1  7  4  7  3.89  988/1256  3.36  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  11  0  1  2  1  4  4.00  394/ 788  3.52  3.41  4.00  3.80  4.00

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  24  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04  4.02  ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  4.54  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  69  ****  4.38  4.53  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  63  ****  4.25  4.44  4.17  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    24  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  69  ****  4.25  4.35  4.14  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                24  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  68  ****  2.38  3.92  3.80  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  25  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  ****  ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75  4.42  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.82  4.58  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0301                University of Maryland                          Page  952
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I            Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    HEINZ, FEDERICO                     Spring 2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      49
Questionnaires:  27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0401              University of Maryland                        Page  953
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I            Baltimore County                          JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C                     Spring 2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  16                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  2  2  4  7  4.07 1031/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  1  4  3  7  4.07  975/1481  4.38  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  1  3  6  5  4.00  893/1249  4.37  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  8  1  1  0  2  3  3.71 1207/1424  4.20  4.14  4.21  4.06  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  0  1  5  2  2  3.50 1083/1396  3.75  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2  0  2  1  3.00 1269/1342  4.02  4.07  4.07  3.88  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  2  0  2  6  5  3.80 1125/1459  4.36  4.28  4.16  4.17  3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  756/1480  4.64  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 2 3 5 1 3  3.00 1354/1450  4.18  4.03  4.09  3.97  3.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  2  0  2  6  5  3.80 1238/1409  4.61  4.40  4.42  4.36  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  1  1  1  1 11  4.33 1221/1407  4.68  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2  1  6  5  1  3.13 1312/1399  4.22  4.05  4.26  4.23  3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  4  0  1  5  5  3.47 1240/1400  4.35  4.18  4.27  4.19  3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 2 0 1 3 1  3.14 1027/1179  3.74  3.69  3.96  3.85  3.14

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  9  4  0  1  1  1.73 1255/1262  2.79  3.20  4.05  3.77  1.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  7  2  2  2  2  2.33 1234/1259  3.31  3.65  4.29  4.06  2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 6 2 3 2 2  2.47 1222/1256  3.36  3.64  4.30  4.08  2.47
4. Were special techniques successful                   1 12  2  1  0  0  0  1.33 ****/ 788  3.52  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    7        0.00-0.99    1          A    6          Required for Majors   1      Graduate      0       Major        0
  28-55    2        1.00-1.99    1          B    0
  56-83    2        2.00-2.99    2          C    5          General               1      Under-grad   16       Non-major   16
  84-150   0        3.00-3.49    2          D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    4          F    1          Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                        responses to be significant
                                            I    0          Other                10
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0501            University of Maryland                          Page  954
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I     Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY               Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    56
Questionnaires: 31                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	19	4.32	759/1481	4.32	4.23	4.29	4.14	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	22	4.58	422/1481	4.38	4.17	4.23	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	460/1249	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	406/1424	4.20	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	2	2	2	10	3.74	934/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	3.89	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	454/1342	4.02	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	10	19	4.52	448/1459	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	6	4.19	1260/1480	4.64	4.83	4.68	4.64	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	334/1450	4.18	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	290/1409	4.61	4.40	4.42	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	804/1407	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.57	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	9	18	4.43	648/1399	4.22	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	23	4.57	531/1400	4.35	4.18	4.27	4.19	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	712/1179	3.74	3.69	3.96	3.85	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	3	3	7	8	3.58	965/1262	2.79	3.20	4.05	3.77	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	7	12	4.21	816/1259	3.31	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	868/1256	3.36	3.64	4.30	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	701/ 788	3.52	3.41	4.00	3.80	3.18

```
                                   Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	2	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0601              University of Maryland                             Page  955
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY    (Instr. A)        Spring 2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 19                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  4  13  4.58  487/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  4  3  12  4.42  632/1481  4.38  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  1  16  4.74  261/1249  4.37  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   7  0  1  2  2   7  4.25  740/1424  4.20  4.14  4.21  4.06  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6  3  1  4  1   4  3.15 1245/1396  3.75  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11  0  1  0  3   4  4.25  542/1342  4.02  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  5  13  4.63  310/1459  4.36  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 11   8  4.42 1100/1480  4.64  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   89/1450  4.18  4.03  4.09  3.97  4.96

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  3  14  4.82  304/1409  4.61  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88  568/1407  4.68  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81  203/1399  4.22  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88  177/1400  4.35  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  8  0  0  0  3   5  4.63  197/1179  3.74  3.69  3.96  3.85  4.63

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  4  1  3  2   4  3.07 1137/1262  2.79  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  1  1  3  2   7  3.93  961/1259  3.31  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  3  1  1  5   4  3.43 1120/1256  3.36  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.43
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   8  0  0  2  1   2  4.00  394/ 788  3.52  3.41  4.00  3.80  4.00

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17   1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.20  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  ****  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      7       0.00-0.99   0        A    4      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major        1
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   1        B    7                                Under-grad   19     Non-major   18
56-83      1       2.00-2.99   4        C    5      General          0    Under-grad   19     Non-major   18
84-150     0       3.00-3.49   3        D    1
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   4        F    1      Electives        0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                             responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other           18
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0601              University of Maryland                         Page 956
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I       Baltimore County                              JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY   (Instr. B)    Spring 2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 19                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  2  4 13  4.58  487/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4  3 12  4.42  632/1481  4.38  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  2  1 16  4.74  261/1249  4.37  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  7  0  1  2  2  7  4.25  740/1424  4.20  4.14  4.21  4.06  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  6  3  1  4  1  4  3.15 1245/1396  3.75  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0 11  0  1  0  3  4  4.25  542/1342  4.02  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  5 13  4.63  310/1459  4.36  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0 11  8  4.42 1100/1480  4.64  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1450  4.18  4.03  4.09  3.97  4.96

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1409  4.61  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1407  4.68  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1399  4.22  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   14  0  0  1  0  0  4  4.40  704/1400  4.35  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14  2  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1179  3.74  3.69  3.96  3.85  4.63

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5  0  4  1  3  2  4  3.07 1137/1262  2.79  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5  0  1  1  3  2  7  3.93  961/1259  3.31  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  3  1  1  5  4  3.43 1120/1256  3.36  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.43
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  8  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  394/ 788  3.52  3.41  4.00  3.80  4.00

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.20  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation     18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  ****  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned       Cum. GPA       Expected Grades       Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      7      0.00-0.99    0      A    4      Required for Majors  0   Graduate     0      Major        1
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    1      B    7                              Under-grad   19     Non-major   18
56-83      1      2.00-2.99    4      C    5      General              0
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    3      D    1
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4      F    1      Electives            0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                              responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               18
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0701            University of Maryland                            Page  957
Title         CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I       Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   WILSON, MARY C               Spring 2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    43
Questionnaires: 29                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  2  7  9  11  4.00 1069/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  4 10  14  4.28  801/1481  4.38  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  3  5 10  10  3.96  927/1249  4.37  4.39  4.27  4.14  3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  12  0  1  6  4   6  3.88 1101/1424  4.20  4.14  4.21  4.06  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  12  1  0  5  4  7  3.94  763/1396  3.75  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  13  0  1  2  7  6  4.13  672/1342  4.02  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  4  9  15  4.31  719/1459  4.36  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  29  5.00    1/1480  4.64  4.83  4.68  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4   2  3  0  4  9  7  3.74 1115/1450  4.18  4.03  4.09  3.97  3.74

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  8  19  4.70  500/1409  4.61  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  2  4  22  4.71  899/1407  4.68  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0  0  2  5  9  12  4.11  966/1399  4.22  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  1  1  1 12  13  4.25  867/1400  4.35  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  20  1  0  1  1  4  4.00 ****/1179  3.74  3.69  3.96  3.85  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0  8  4  6  3  8  2.97 1158/1262  2.79  3.20  4.05  3.77  2.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1   0  5  3  6  4 10  3.39 1128/1259  3.31  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2   0  2  2  3  9 11  3.93  967/1256  3.36  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.93
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  22  2  0  1  0  2  3.00 ****/ 788  3.52  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    11       0.00-0.99    0        A    6        Required for Majors   2     Graduate     0      Major        3
 28-55     5       1.00-1.99    0        B   12
 56-83     4       2.00-2.99    5        C    8        General               0     Under-grad  29      Non-major   26
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49   10        D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    4        F    1        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                27
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  958
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY           Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   SLOWIKOWSKI, WI              Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      62
Questionnaires:  33                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   2   3  10  18  4.33  749/1481  4.49  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1  13  19  4.55  469/1481  4.65  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   6  24  4.64  369/1249  4.70  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  12   0   1   2   9   9  4.24  762/1424  4.36  4.14  4.21  4.06  4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  13   1   0   4   8   7  4.00  707/1396  3.99  3.83  3.98  3.89  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15   0   0   1   7  10  4.50  303/1342  4.37  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   2   8  22  4.55  413/1459  4.68  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1   0   0   1   2  28  4.87  743/1480  4.97  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  1   0   0   1  11  14  4.50  334/1450  4.62  4.03  4.09  3.97  4.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   2   7  23  4.66  574/1409  4.75  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   1   4   8  19  4.41 1184/1407  4.73  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   2   8  22  4.63  431/1399  4.60  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1   0   1   1   5  24  4.68  409/1400  4.70  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 22   2   0   0   3   4  3.78  780/1179  3.70  3.69  3.96  3.85  3.78

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   8   5   5   3   8  2.93 1167/1262  3.24  3.20  4.05  3.77  2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  10   2   5   5   6  2.82 1196/1259  3.48  3.65  4.29  4.06  2.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   8   4   3   6   7  3.00 1167/1256  3.65  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   5  24   1   0   0   1   2  3.75 ****/ 788  2.97  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  29   3   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           32   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 32   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04  4.02  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  4.54  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  69  ****  4.38  4.53  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  63  ****  4.25  4.44  4.17  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    30   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  69  ****  4.25  4.35  4.14  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                30   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  68  ****  2.38  3.92  3.80  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 30   0   1   0   0   2   0  3.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30   0   0   0   0   3   0  4.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       30   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   31   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  ****  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.48  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    30   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75  4.42  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      31   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       30   2   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     30   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.82  4.58  ****
```

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0201                University of Maryland                                  Page  959
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                                       JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY   (Instr. A)        Spring 2006                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires: 35                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  4 10 20  4.40  678/1481  4.49  4.23  4.29 4.14  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  4  6 25  4.60  399/1481  4.65  4.17  4.23 4.18  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  7 26  4.69  310/1249  4.70  4.39  4.27 4.14  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  15  1  1  2  3 13  4.30  684/1424  4.36  4.14  4.21 4.06  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  11  0  1  7  7  9  4.00  707/1396  3.99  3.83  3.98 3.89  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 1 3 8 8  4.15  638/1342  4.37  4.07  4.07 3.88  4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  7 28  4.80  161/1459  4.68  4.28  4.16 4.17  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0 34  5.00    1/1480  4.97  4.83  4.68 4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 0 0 1 7 20 4.68  210/1450  4.62  4.03  4.09 3.97  4.75

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  9 25  4.69  529/1409  4.75  4.40  4.42 4.36  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  4 31  4.89  545/1407  4.73  4.70  4.69 4.57  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2 11 22  4.57  491/1399  4.60  4.05  4.26 4.23  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  5 28  4.74  324/1400  4.70  4.18  4.27 4.19  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 25 1 0 1 2 5  4.11  549/1179  3.70  3.69  3.96 3.85  4.11

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  3  4  6  8  8  3.48 1002/1262  3.24  3.20  4.05 3.77  3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  4  5  6 14  4.03  886/1259  3.48  3.65  4.29 4.06  4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 1 5 10 13 4.21 804/1256  3.65  3.64  4.30 4.08  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  19  2  1  5  0  1  2.67  749/ 788  2.97  3.41  4.00 3.80  2.67
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    7       0.00-0.99   0       A  12       Required for Majors  2     Graduate     0      Major       5
 28-55    6       1.00-1.99   0       B   8
 56-83    3       2.00-2.99   2       C   8       General              5     Under-grad  35      Non-major  30
 84-150   4       3.00-3.49   8       D   1
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00  10       F   0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0       Other               25
                                      ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0201            University of Maryland                        Page  960
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                        JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    TIGHE, BONNY   (Instr. B)        Spring 2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires:  35                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  1  4 10 20  4.40  678/1481  4.49 4.23  4.29 4.14  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4  6 25  4.60  399/1481  4.65 4.17  4.23 4.18  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  2  7 26  4.69  310/1249  4.70 4.39  4.27 4.14  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0 15  1  1  2  3 13  4.30  684/1424  4.36 4.14  4.21 4.06  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11  0  1  7  7  9  4.00  707/1396  3.99 3.83  3.98 3.89  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15  0  1  3  8  8  4.15  638/1342  4.37 4.07  4.07 3.88  4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  7 28  4.80  161/1459  4.68 4.28  4.16 4.17  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  1  0  0  0  0 34  5.00    1/1480  4.97 4.83  4.68 4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  135/1450  4.62 4.03  4.09 3.97  4.75

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       25  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  514/1409  4.75 4.40  4.42 4.36  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  25  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  500/1407  4.73 4.70  4.69 4.57  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 25  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  459/1399  4.60 4.05  4.26 4.23  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    25  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  146/1400  4.70 4.18  4.27 4.19  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 26  7  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1179  3.70 3.69  3.96 3.85  4.11

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6  0  3  4  6  8  8  3.48 1002/1262  3.24 3.20  4.05 3.77  3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  0  4  5  6 14  4.03  886/1259  3.48 3.65  4.29 4.06  4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  1  5 10 13  4.21  804/1256  3.65 3.64  4.30 4.08  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                 7 19  2  1  5  0  1  2.67  749/ 788  2.97 3.41  4.00 3.80  2.67

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    7      0.00-0.99    0      A  12      Required for Majors  2    Graduate      0     Major        5
  28-55    6      1.00-1.99    0      B   8                                Under-grad   35     Non-major   30
  56-83    3      2.00-2.99    2      C   8      General              5    Under-grad   35     Non-major   30
  84-150   4      3.00-3.49    8      D   1
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00   10      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                               responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               25
                                      ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0301            University of Maryland                             Page  961
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY       Baltimore County                                 JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    KAPOOR, JAGMOHA             Spring 2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      56
Questionnaires:  32                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  1  8 23 4.69  373/1481  4.49  4.23 4.29  4.14  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3 29 4.91  115/1481  4.65  4.17 4.23  4.18  4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  2 30 4.94   99/1249  4.70  4.39 4.27  4.14  4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0 15  0  0  2  2 13 4.65  302/1424  4.36  4.14 4.21  4.06  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 14 2  3  2  3  8 3.67  985/1396  3.99  3.83 3.98  3.89  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 17 0 0 0 2 12 4.86  99/1342  4.37  4.07 4.07  3.88  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  4  4 24 4.63  321/1459  4.68  4.28 4.16  4.17  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  1  0  0  0  0 31 5.00    1/1480  4.97  4.83 4.68  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 1 7 18 4.65  224/1450  4.62  4.03 4.09  3.97  4.65


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  4 27 4.87  231/1409  4.75  4.40 4.42  4.36  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  1  4 26 4.81  728/1407  4.73  4.70 4.69  4.57  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 7 23 4.71  322/1399  4.60  4.05 4.26  4.23  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  1  1  4 24 4.70  385/1400  4.70  4.18 4.27  4.19  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 17 1 1 2 2 7 4.00  590/1179  3.70  3.69 3.96  3.85  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7 0 11 2 4 2 6 2.60 1213/1262  3.24  3.20 4.05  3.77  2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8 0  9 1 5 2 7 2.88 1190/1259  3.48  3.65 4.29  4.06  2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 7 3 5 0 6 2.76 1205/1256  3.65  3.64 4.30  4.08  2.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  8 19 1 0 1 0 3 3.80 ****/ 788  2.97  3.41 4.00  3.80  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  28 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 246 **** **** 4.20  3.93  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 3 0 0 0 1 2.00 ****/ 249 **** **** 4.11  3.95  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 242 **** **** 4.40  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           28 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.20  4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  28 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.04  4.02  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  29 0 3 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  59 **** 5.00 4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  29 0 3 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  51 **** **** 4.00  3.44  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0 3 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  55 **** **** 4.55  4.48  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      8      0.00-0.99    0       A  18      Required for Majors   3    Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55      7      1.00-1.99    0       B   6                                 
  56-83      6      2.00-2.99    4       C   4      General               2    Under-grad   32      Non-major   32
  84-150     1      3.00-3.49    5       D   0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   12       F   1      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                responses to be significant
                                         I   0      Other                25
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0401          University of Maryland                        Page  962
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY        Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  KAPOOR, JAGMOHA             Spring 2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    52
Questionnaires:  25               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                     Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions             NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean  Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1  0  0  0  0  8 16 4.67  395/1481 4.49 4.23 4.29 4.14 4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  3 21 4.88  135/1481 4.65 4.17 4.23 4.18 4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  0  2  3 19 4.71  287/1249 4.70 4.39 4.27 4.14 4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  7  0  0  1  7  9 4.47  473/1424 4.36 4.14 4.21 4.06 4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 17  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  363/1396 3.99 3.83 3.98 3.89 4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0  0  1  3  8 4.58  251/1342 4.37 4.07 4.07 3.88 4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  3  5 17 4.56  390/1459 4.68 4.28 4.16 4.17 4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  1  0  0  0  0 24 5.00    1/1480 4.97 4.83 4.68 4.64 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  0  0  6 11 4.65  231/1450 4.62 4.03 4.09 3.97 4.65


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  1  1 23 4.88  217/1409 4.75 4.40 4.42 4.36 4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  4 21 4.84  636/1407 4.73 4.70 4.69 4.57 4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  3  4 18 4.60  459/1399 4.60 4.05 4.26 4.23 4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  2  3 20 4.72  361/1400 4.70 4.18 4.27 4.19 4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 14 1  1  7  2  0 2.91 1087/1179 3.70 3.69 3.96 3.85 2.91


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  3  1  5  7  4 3.40 1034/1262 3.24 3.20 4.05 3.77 3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  1  1  5  6  7 3.85 1002/1259 3.48 3.65 4.29 4.06 3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  1  1  5  4  7 3.83 1012/1256 3.65 3.64 4.30 4.08 3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  7  1  2  2  3  4 3.58  588/ 788 2.97 3.41 4.00 3.80 3.58


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 22  1  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 246 **** **** 4.20 3.93 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 249 **** **** 4.11 3.95 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 1 0 1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/ 242 **** **** 4.40 4.33 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          23  1  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.20 4.20 ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 0 0 0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.80 4.49 4.54 ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27   12      0.00-0.99   0      A  12    Required for Majors  1    Graduate    0    Major      0
 28-55    6      1.00-1.99   0      B  10
 56-83    1      2.00-2.99   3      C   3    General              0    Under-grad 25    Non-major 25
 84-150   1      3.00-3.49   5      D   0
 Grad.    0      3.50-4.00  12      F   0    Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P   0                             responses to be significant
                                    I   0    Other               21
                                    ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0501            University of Maryland                           Page  963
Title          CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY      Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    SLOWIKOWSKI, WI            Spring 2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      77
Questionnaires:  38                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  5 11 22  4.45  626/1481  4.49  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  4 11 22  4.39  671/1481  4.65  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  3  6 27  4.53  479/1249  4.70  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  21  0  2  1  6  8  4.18  829/1424  4.36  4.14  4.21  4.06  4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  20  0  2  6  3  7  3.83  854/1396  3.99  3.83  3.98  3.89  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 19 0  0  5  9  5  4.00  755/1342  4.37  4.07  4.07  3.88  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  8 29  4.74  210/1459  4.68  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1 37  4.97  211/1480  4.97  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1  0  1 14 17  4.39  483/1450  4.62  4.03  4.09  3.97  4.39

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  0  0  6 31  4.74  450/1409  4.75  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  1  1  3  5 28  4.53 1091/1407  4.73  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  3 10 24  4.47  601/1399  4.60  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  1  4  5 27  4.47  624/1400  4.70  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 33 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1179  3.70  3.69  3.96  3.85  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  3  3 11 13  8  3.53  987/1262  3.24  3.20  4.05  3.77  3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  5  5 10 11  7  3.26 1143/1259  3.48  3.65  4.29  4.06  3.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  2  2  9  9 14  3.86 1000/1256  3.65  3.64  4.30  4.08  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   0  37  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 788  2.97  3.41  4.00  3.80  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 36 0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.95  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  37  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  37  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  3.44  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.48  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      8       0.00-0.99    0      A   10       Required for Majors   2      Graduate      0        Major        2
 28-55     11       1.00-1.99    1      B   16
 56-83     11       2.00-2.99   12      C    9       General               2      Under-grad   38        Non-major   36
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49    9      D    2
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    9      F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                32
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  964
Title      ELEMENTARY CALCULUS                Baltimore County                           JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   ALLEN, KEVIN P                    Spring 2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    42
Questionnaires:  25                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  0  1 11 11  4.16   947/1481   3.40  4.23  4.29  4.14  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  1  8 14  4.32   747/1481   3.39  4.17  4.23  4.18  4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  2  4  6 12  4.04   877/1249   3.45  4.39  4.27  4.14  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  2  4  3  5  3.79  1170/1424   3.17  4.14  4.21  4.06  3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  0  0  5  6  6  4.06   675/1396   3.65  3.83  3.98  3.89  4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 1  0  3  4  4  3.83   934/1342   3.15  4.07  4.07  3.88  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  3  4 16  4.46   535/1459   3.84  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96   351/1480   4.98  4.83  4.68  4.64  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  1  1  4  7  4  3.71  1142/1450   2.81  4.03  4.09  3.97  3.71


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  5 18  4.71   500/1409   3.75  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  2  4 19  4.68   952/1407   4.06  4.70  4.69  4.57  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  1  1  8 14  4.32   763/1399   3.14  4.05  4.26  4.23  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  1  9 14  4.40   704/1400   3.24  4.18  4.27  4.19  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 18 0  1  1  0  5  4.29   419/1179   4.29  3.69  3.96  3.85  4.29


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/1262   1.11  3.20  4.05  3.77  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/1259   1.94  3.65  4.29  4.06  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/1256   1.39  3.64  4.30  4.08  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5        0.00-0.99   0        A    6        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0        Major       0
  28-55     3        1.00-1.99   1        B    4                                                          
  56-83     4        2.00-2.99   6        C   11        General            1     Under-grad   25        Non-major  25
  84-150    4        3.00-3.49   9        D    3                                                          
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   6        F    0        Electives          1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    1                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other             21
                                          ?    0
```

```
                                               Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  6  6 10  4  2  2.64 1475/1481  3.40  4.23  4.29 4.14  2.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  7  9  6  4  2  2.46 1472/1481  3.39  4.17  4.23 4.18  2.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  7  5  6  5  5  2.86 1210/1249  3.45  4.39  4.27 4.14  2.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  12  6  1  5  2  2  2.56 1410/1424  3.17  4.14  4.21 4.06  2.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 10 3  1  3  7  2  3.25 1199/1396  3.65  3.83  3.98 3.89  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 15 6 0 3 3 1 2.46 1328/1342  3.15  4.07  4.07 3.88  2.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  5  6  2  8  7  3.21 1345/1459  3.84  4.28  4.16 4.17  3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1  0  0  0  0 27  5.00    1/1480  4.98  4.83  4.68 4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 12 3 6 2 0 1.91 1445/1450  2.81  4.03  4.09 3.97  1.91

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  8  4  7  4  5  2.79 1385/1409  3.75  4.40  4.42 4.36  2.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  3  6  4  4 10  3.44 1376/1407  4.06  4.70  4.69 4.57  3.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 13  6  6  3  0  1.96 1397/1399  3.14  4.05  4.26 4.23  1.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1 13  4  6  3  1  2.07 1391/1400  3.24  4.18  4.27 4.19  2.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 23 2 0 1 1 0 2.25 ****/1179  4.29  3.69  3.96 3.85  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 16 2 0 0 0 1.11 1259/1262  1.11  3.20  4.05 3.77  1.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  8  5  4  0  1  1.94 1250/1259  1.94  3.65  4.29 4.06  1.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 11 7 0 0 0 1.39 1253/1256  1.39  3.64  4.30 4.08  1.39
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  18  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00 3.80  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3       0.00-0.99   0         A   3         Required for Majors   5     Graduate      0        Major        0
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0         B   6
56-83      6       2.00-2.99   6         C  11         General               0     Under-grad   29        Non-major   29
84-150     2       3.00-3.49   6         D   2
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1         F   3         Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I   0         Other                22
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 215  0201                    University of Maryland                                    Page  966
Title          FINITE MATH FOR INFO S             Baltimore County                                         JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    WANG, DAN                          Spring 2006                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    45
Questionnaires: 18                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3   8   7  4.22   883/1481  4.22  4.23  4.29  4.40  4.22
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   8   9  4.44   603/1481  4.44  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.44
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   4  14  4.78   228/1249  4.78  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.78
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9   0   0   1   3   5  4.44   509/1424  4.44  4.14  4.21  4.28  4.44
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   0   0   0   5   8  4.62   233/1396  4.62  3.83  3.98  3.94  4.62
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5   0   0   3   2   8  4.38   424/1342  4.38  4.07  4.07  4.05  4.38
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   3  13  4.61   332/1459  4.61  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.61
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  18  5.00     1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.68  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0   0   6   7   3  3.81  1046/1450  3.81  4.03  4.09  4.15  3.81


                 Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   6  10  4.63   618/1409  4.63  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.63
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   1   5  10  4.56  1061/1407  4.56  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.56
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   2   7   6  4.27   819/1399  4.27  4.05  4.26  4.29  4.27
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   1   1   6   8  4.31   816/1400  4.31  4.18  4.27  4.34  4.31
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 11  0   0   1   2   2  4.20   487/1179  4.20  3.69  3.96  4.05  4.20


                 Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0   3   1   0   0   1  2.00  1245/1262  2.00  3.20  4.05  4.11  2.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0   1   0   0   1   3  4.00   895/1259  4.00  3.65  4.29  4.34  4.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  1   0   0   1   3  4.00   901/1256  4.00  3.64  4.30  4.28  4.00


                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A   10        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0        Major       0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    4
 56-83      3        2.00-2.99    0        C    1        General              0     Under-grad  18        Non-major  18
 84-150     6        3.00-3.49    5        D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other               15
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  967
Title       INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   HOFFMAN, KATHLE               Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     47
Questionnaires: 30                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                   Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  6 13 11  4.17   947/1481  4.14  4.23  4.29  4.40  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  6 14  9  4.03   987/1481  3.98  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  3  9 17  4.40   624/1249  4.19  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  12  0  1  3  6  8  4.17   840/1424  3.87  4.14  4.21  4.28  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  11  1  1  6  3  7  3.78   901/1396  3.95  3.83  3.98  3.94  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 18  0  1  4  2  5  3.92   871/1342  3.88  4.07  4.07  4.05  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  5  5 19  4.40   611/1459  4.34  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1 14 14  4.45  1086/1480  4.86  4.83  4.68  4.68  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  0  5 10  7  4.09   786/1450  3.85  4.03  4.09  4.15  4.09

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  4  5 20  4.55   705/1409  4.31  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  4 25  4.80   728/1407  4.78  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  4  6  8 11  3.90  1100/1399  3.77  4.05  4.26  4.29  3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  4  5  6 15  4.07   997/1400  3.78  4.18  4.27  4.34  4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 23 0  0  2  2  3  4.14  ****/1179  3.23  3.69  3.96  4.05  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  1  0  0  5  2  3.88   816/1262  3.28  3.20  4.05  4.11  3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  ****/1259  3.08  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  ****/1256  3.92  3.64  4.30  4.28  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type            Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0       A    6      Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0    Major       5
 28-55      8       1.00-1.99   0       B   15
 56-83      6       2.00-2.99   5       C    5      General              0    Under-grad   30    Non-major  25
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49   8       D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   7       F    0      Electives            3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                               responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               26
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0201                    University of Maryland                          Page 968
Title          INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR             Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    MUSCEDERE, MICH                    Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 25                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                     Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                        NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   2   7   9   7  3.84 1199/1481  4.14  4.23   4.29  4.40  3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   3   7  11   4  3.64 1264/1481  3.98  4.17   4.23  4.29  3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   1   2   7  10   5  3.64 1086/1249  4.19  4.39   4.27  4.36  3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   8   0   2   6   8   1  3.47 1281/1424  3.87  4.14   4.21  4.28  3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5   1   2   5   5   6  3.68  972/1396  3.95  3.83   3.98  3.94  3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10  2   2   1   4   5  3.57 1084/1342  3.88  4.07   4.07  4.05  3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0   0   2   6   5  10  4.00  961/1459  4.34  4.28   4.16  4.17  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0  25  5.00    1/1480  4.86  4.83   4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0   4  10  10   0  3.25 1307/1450  3.85  4.03   4.09  4.15  3.25


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   1  10   7   7  3.80 1238/1409  4.31  4.40   4.42  4.47  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   8  17  4.68  952/1407  4.78  4.70   4.69  4.78  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0   2   4   8   7   4  3.28 1288/1399  3.77  4.05   4.26  4.29  3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   4   5   6   5   5  3.08 1308/1400  3.78  4.18   4.27  4.34  3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 8   2   6   2   5  2.74 1106/1179  3.23  3.69   3.96  4.05  2.74


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  2   3   5   3   0  2.69 1203/1262  3.28  3.20   4.05  4.11  2.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  1   4   3   3   2  3.08 1159/1259  3.08  3.65   4.29  4.34  3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  2   2   4   5  3.92  967/1256  3.92  3.64   4.30  4.28  3.92
4. Were special techniques successful                 12   4   4   1   3   1   0  2.11  780/ 788  2.11  3.41   4.00  3.98  2.11


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2        0.00-0.99    2         A    5        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major      1
  28-55      5        1.00-1.99    1         B   10
  56-83      5        2.00-2.99    2         C    5        General               2     Under-grad   25      Non-major 24
  84-150     3        3.00-3.49    7         D    2
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    5         F    0        Electives             6     #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                             I    0        Other                18
                                             ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0301              University of Maryland                      Page  969
Title        INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                          JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  LO, JAMES T                     Spring 2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     42
Questionnaires:  21                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  2  5  6  8  3.95 1115/1481  4.14  4.23  4.29  4.40  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  6  5  8  3.90 1118/1481  3.98  4.17  4.23  4.29  3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  5  3 12  4.24  757/1249  4.19  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   8  1  0  4  2  6  3.92 1061/1424  3.87  4.14  4.21  4.28  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5  0  2  4  2  8  4.00  707/1396  3.95  3.83  3.98  3.94  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  8  1  1  3  2  6  3.85  927/1342  3.88  4.07  4.07  4.05  3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  3  4 14  4.52  436/1459  4.34  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 21  5.00    1/1480  4.86  4.83  4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0  1  6  5  4  3.75 1098/1450  3.85  4.03  4.09  4.15  3.75


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  2  3  4 12  4.24 1043/1409  4.31  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  5 16  4.76  804/1407  4.78  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  2  6  3  8  3.75 1163/1399  3.77  4.05  4.26  4.29  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  0  7  5  7  3.71 1165/1400  3.78  4.18  4.27  4.34  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 16  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1179  3.23  3.69  3.96  4.05  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 ****/1262  3.28  3.20  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/1259  3.08  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 ****/1256  3.92  3.64  4.30  4.28  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    1       A   14        Required for Majors  1      Graduate      0        Major        1
  28-55     3       1.00-1.99    0       B    3
  56-83    11       2.00-2.99    3       C    2        General              2      Under-grad   21        Non-major   20
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49    7       D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5       F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    1                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               19
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0401              University of Maryland                        Page  970
Title          INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR       Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    LO, JAMES T                  Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       40
Questionnaires:   21                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  6 14  4.62  450/1481  4.14  4.23  4.29  4.40  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  5  4 12  4.33  736/1481  3.98  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  5 13  4.48  535/1249  4.19  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   8  0  1  3  4  4  3.92 1074/1424  3.87  4.14  4.21  4.28  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6  0  1  1  5  8  4.33  435/1396  3.95  3.83  3.98  3.94  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0  1  2  6  7  4.19  603/1342  3.88  4.07  4.07  4.05  4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  4  4 13  4.43  580/1459  4.34  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 21  5.00    1/1480  4.86  4.83  4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  1  2  5  9  4.29  588/1450  3.85  4.03  4.09  4.15  4.29

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  5 13  4.63  603/1409  4.31  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  522/1407  4.78  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  2  2  6  9  4.16  920/1399  3.77  4.05  4.26  4.29  4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  2  2  4 11  4.26  859/1400  3.78  4.18  4.27  4.34  4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 12  0  2  1  1  3  3.71  820/1179  3.23  3.69  3.96  4.05  3.71

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 ****/1262  3.28  3.20  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1259  3.08  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/1256  3.92  3.64  4.30  4.28  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 788  2.11  3.41  4.00  3.98  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0        A  15      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0        Major        3
28-55      3     1.00-1.99    0        B   4
56-83      4     2.00-2.99    3        C   1      General               1     Under-grad   21        Non-major   18
84-150     5     3.00-3.49    6        D   0
Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    4        F   0      Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                18
                                       ?   1
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.17	4.23	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	219/1249	4.79	4.39	4.27	4.36	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.14	4.21	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	3	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.46	3.83	3.98	3.94	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	405/1342	4.40	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.28	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.83	4.68	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	389/1450	4.46	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	588/1409	4.64	4.40	4.42	4.47	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.70	4.69	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.29	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	444/1400	4.64	4.18	4.27	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.69	3.96	4.05	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.20	4.05	4.11	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	4.83	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	3.64	4.30	4.28	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.41	4.00	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  972
Title      INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                                 JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J                  Spring 2006                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     58
Questionnaires:  43                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   5   0   0   2   4  11  21  4.34  739/1481  4.31  4.23  4.29  4.40  4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5   0   0   1   2  13  22  4.47  560/1481  4.24  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   0   0   0   4  10  24  4.53  479/1249  4.31  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5  16   0   0   3   6  13  4.45  497/1424  4.37  4.14  4.21  4.28  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  14   2   2   5   5  10  3.79  885/1396  4.01  3.83  3.98  3.94  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 18  0  1   2   4  13  4.45  364/1342  4.46  4.07  4.07  4.05  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0   0   0   1  10  27  4.68  253/1459  4.62  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   0   0   0   0   0  38  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1  0  0   6  14  13  4.21  672/1450  3.99  4.03  4.09  4.15  4.21

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   0   0   7  31  4.82  319/1409  4.68  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   0   9  29  4.76  804/1407  4.65  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   0   2  13  23  4.55  513/1399  4.03  4.05  4.26  4.29  4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   1   1   4   8  24  4.39  716/1400  4.10  4.18  4.27  4.34  4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 30  0  1   1   1   5  4.25 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  4.05  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 34  0   2   2   1   1   3  3.11 ****/1262  2.83  3.20  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 33  0   1   0   2   3   4  3.90 ****/1259  2.33  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 33 0  0   1   1   3   5  4.20 ****/1256  2.00  3.64  4.30  4.28  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  33   8   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.98  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 42   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.67  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 42  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    42   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      42   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.66  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       42   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83  4.43  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    2      A   14      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0     Major       3
28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0      B   12
56-83     10      2.00-2.99    4      C   10      General               2     Under-grad   43     Non-major  40
84-150     5      3.00-3.49    7      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   14      F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                33
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0201                    University of Maryland                              Page  973
Title        INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT                  Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  LYNN, YEN-MOW                            Spring 2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      38
Questionnaires: 12                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  2  1  5  4  3.92 1152/1481  4.31  4.23  4.29 4.40  3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  1  4  1  5  3.67 1253/1481  4.24  4.17  4.23 4.29  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  4  0  3  5  3.75 1046/1249  4.31  4.39  4.27 4.36  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  4  0  0  2  3  2  4.00  959/1424  4.37  4.14  4.21 4.28  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  0  1  1  0  2  3.75  918/1396  4.01  3.83  3.98 3.94  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  542/1342  4.46  4.07  4.07 4.05  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  1  1  8  4.45  535/1459  4.62  4.28  4.16 4.17  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68 4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 2 1 3 1 2  3.00 1354/1450  3.99  4.03  4.09 4.15  3.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36  935/1409  4.68  4.40  4.42 4.47  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36 1205/1407  4.65  4.70  4.69 4.78  4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2  2  4  2  1  2.82 1356/1399  4.03  4.05  4.26 4.29  2.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  4  1  4  2  3.17 1297/1400  4.10  4.18  4.27 4.34  3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96 4.05  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  2  0  2  1  1  2.83 1186/1262  2.83  3.20  4.05 4.11  2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  2  0  4  0  0  2.33 1234/1259  2.33  3.65  4.29 4.34  2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  2  1  2  0  0  2.00 1246/1256  2.00  3.64  4.30 4.28  2.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  4  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00 3.98  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20 4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11 4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40 4.63  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20 4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04 4.28  ****


                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0         0.00-0.99   0        A    1         Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0       Major       0
  28-55      3         1.00-1.99   0        B    6
  56-83      0         2.00-2.99   1        C    4         General              0    Under-grad   12       Non-major  12
  84-150     0         3.00-3.49   2        D    0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   2        F    1         Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                            I    0         Other               11
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0301            University of Maryland                        Page  974
Title         INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT        Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                  Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      54
Questionnaires:  39                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  0  9  29  4.67  395/1481  4.31 4.23  4.29 4.40  4.67
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  1  3  7  27  4.58  434/1481  4.24 4.17  4.23 4.29  4.58
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  7  29  4.64  357/1249  4.31 4.39  4.27 4.36  4.64
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  17  0  0  1  5  15  4.67  287/1424  4.37 4.14  4.21 4.28  4.67
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  19  0  1  2  3  13  4.47  321/1396  4.01 3.83  3.98 3.94  4.47
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 22 0  1  0  2  13  4.69  174/1342  4.46 4.07  4.07 4.05  4.69
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3  5  31  4.72  224/1459  4.62 4.28  4.16 4.17  4.72
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0  38  5.00    1/1480  5.00 4.83  4.68 4.68  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0  2  4  26  4.75  164/1450  3.99 4.03  4.09 4.15  4.75

                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  3  33  4.86  246/1409  4.68 4.40  4.42 4.47  4.86
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  4  32  4.84  659/1407  4.65 4.70  4.69 4.78  4.84
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  3  4  30  4.73  300/1399  4.03 4.05  4.26 4.29  4.73
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   1  0  0  3  3  29  4.74  324/1400  4.10 4.18  4.27 4.34  4.74
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 26 1  0  0  5  3  4.00 ****/1179  **** 3.69  3.96 4.05  ****

                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 34 0 0  0  1  0  4  4.60 ****/1262  2.83 3.20  4.05 4.11  ****
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 0 0  0  1  0  4  4.60 ****/1259  2.33 3.65  4.29 4.34  ****
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34 0 0 0  1  1  3  4.40 ****/1256  2.00 3.64  4.30 4.28  ****
 4. Were special techniques successful                  34   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 788  **** 3.41  4.00 3.98  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1       A   18      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major        3
 28-55      8       1.00-1.99    0       B   10
 56-83     18       2.00-2.99    6       C    4      General               0      Under-grad   39      Non-major   36
 84-150     4       3.00-3.49   12       D    1
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   11       F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                33
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0101              University of Maryland                      Page  975
Title      MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS           Baltimore County                           JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                  Spring 2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      48
Questionnaires:  21                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                   NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   2  0  1  5 12  4.25  844/1481  4.23  4.23  4.29  4.40  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   2  0  0  8  9  4.16  917/1481  4.21  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1  0  2  3 14  4.45  573/1249  4.36  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  10   0  0  3  3  4  4.10  908/1424  4.06  4.14  4.21  4.28  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 10   0  0  1  2  6  4.56  269/1396  4.19  3.83  3.98  3.94  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10  1  0  1  2  5  4.11  683/1342  4.29  4.07  4.07  4.05  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0  1  2  3 14  4.50  460/1459  4.42  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  1  0 19  4.90  702/1480  4.94  4.83  4.68  4.68  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  0  5  3 10  4.11  781/1450  3.67  4.03  4.09  4.15  4.11

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1  0  2  2 14  4.47  800/1409  4.37  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   1  0  2  1 15  4.53 1091/1407  4.38  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   1  1  1  5 11  4.26  819/1399  3.95  4.05  4.26  4.29  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1  1  2  3 12  4.26  859/1400  3.89  4.18  4.27  4.34  4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 12  0  0  1  1  3  4.40 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  4.05  ****

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0   0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0   0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.28  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  17   3   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.98  ****

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   1   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40  4.63  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04  4.28  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  69  ****  4.38  4.53  4.83  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  63  ****  4.25  4.44  4.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  68  ****  2.38  3.92  3.55  ****

          Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  4.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  4.80  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.66  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83  4.43  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.82  5.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 21   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   4   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   1   Major   0
28-55   5   1.00-1.99   0   B   9
56-83   6   2.00-2.99   1   C   3   General   0   Under-grad 20   Non-major   21
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   9   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   17
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0201                University of Maryland                              Page  976
Title      MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS                 Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    GULER, OSMAN                          Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    43
Questionnaires: 23                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  4  4 14  4.35  739/1481  4.23  4.23  4.29  4.40  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  4  7 11  4.22  865/1481  4.21  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  4  4 15  4.48  535/1249  4.36  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  1  5  5  4  3.80 1160/1424  4.06  4.14  4.21  4.28  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  0  0  5  4  6  4.07  668/1396  4.19  3.83  3.98  3.94  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13 0 0 2 0 8  4.60  238/1342  4.29  4.07  4.07  4.05  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3  5 15  4.52  436/1459  4.42  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00    1/1480  4.94  4.83  4.68  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 2 0 7 7 3  3.47 1236/1450  3.67  4.03  4.09  4.15  3.47

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  1  1  1  8 10  4.19 1068/1409  4.37  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  1  2  6 12  4.38 1194/1407  4.38  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  2  7  5  6  3.62 1213/1399  3.95  4.05  4.26  4.29  3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1  3  4  2  4  7  3.40 1256/1400  3.89  4.18  4.27  4.34  3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 1 0 2 0 0  2.33 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  4.05  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 2 1 0 0 1  2.25 ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 0 3 1 0  2.80 ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 1 0 2 1 0  2.75 ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.28  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  19   3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.98  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  4.32  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2       0.00-0.99   1       A   8      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major      1
28-55    10       1.00-1.99   0       B  10
56-83     3       2.00-2.99   3       C   4      General              0      Under-grad  23      Non-major 22
84-150    0       3.00-3.49   1       D   0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00  11       F   0      Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   1                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               22
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0301            University of Maryland                            Page  977
Title       MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS         Baltimore County                              JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     SOVEREIGN, BRET                   Spring 2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     55
Questionnaires: 25                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
                        General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0    0    0    0    7    9    9  4.08 1018/1481  4.23  4.23  4.29  4.40  4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0    0    0    0    4   11   10  4.24  843/1481  4.21  4.17  4.23  4.29  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0    0    0    0    7    7   11  4.16  810/1249  4.36  4.39  4.27  4.36  4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   14    0    0    2    4    5  4.27  717/1424  4.06  4.14  4.21  4.28  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6    0    0    6    8    5  3.95  763/1396  4.19  3.83  3.98  3.94  3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0    0    3    4    5  4.17  626/1342  4.29  4.07  4.07  4.05  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1    0    0    0    6    6   12  4.25  775/1459  4.42  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0    1    0    0    0    2   22  4.92  631/1480  4.94  4.83  4.68  4.68  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0    0   11    8    0  3.42 1258/1450  3.67  4.03  4.09  4.15  3.42

                        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0    0    0    0    2   10   13  4.44  839/1409  4.37  4.40  4.42  4.47  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0    0    0    1    6    4   14  4.24 1264/1407  4.38  4.70  4.69  4.78  4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0    0    1    7    9    8  3.96 1039/1399  3.95  4.05  4.26  4.29  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0    0    1    1    5    8   10  4.00 1017/1400  3.89  4.18  4.27  4.34  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 21  1    0    0    2    0  3.00 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  4.05  ****

                        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0    0    0    1    4    1  4.00 ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0    1    0    1    4    0  3.33 ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0   1    1    0    2    2  3.50 ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.28  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  18    5    0    0    1    1    0  3.50 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.98  ****

                        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23    1    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0  0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24  0  0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/ 242  ****  ****  4.40  4.63  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24    0    0    0    1    0    0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.20  4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24    0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.04  4.28  ****

                        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24  0    0    0    0    0    1  5.00 ****/  68  ****  4.80  4.49  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0  0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  69  ****  4.38  4.53  4.83  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24  0    0    0    0    0    1  5.00 ****/  63  ****  4.25  4.44  4.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    24    0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  69  ****  4.25  4.35  4.72  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                24    0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  68  ****  2.38  3.92  3.55  ****

                        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24    0    0    0    1    0    0  3.00 ****/  59  ****  5.00  4.30  4.67  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24    0    0    0    1    0    0  3.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.00  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24    0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.60  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24    0    0    0    0    0    1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.26  4.69  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24    0    0    0    0    0    1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.42  4.80  ****

                        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24  0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.55  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24    0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.75  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24    0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  51  ****  ****  4.65  4.66  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24    0    0    0    0    1    0  4.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.83  4.43  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     24    0    0    0    1    0    0  3.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.82  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0101              University of Maryland                                     Page  978
Title       INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I            Baltimore County                                        JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   RATHINAM, MURUH                  Spring 2006                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     42
Questionnaires:  16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  0  4 11  4.50   549/1481   4.49 4.23   4.29 4.29  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  8  5  4.13   942/1481   4.35 4.17   4.23 4.23  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  8  8  4.50   498/1249   4.53 4.39   4.27 4.28  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  1  2  5  2  3.80  1160/1424   4.11 4.14   4.21 4.27  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  0  0  5  5  2  3.75   918/1396   3.59 3.83   3.98 4.00  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6 1 0 2 3 3  3.78   974/1342   4.14 4.07   4.07 4.12  3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  1  8  6  4.33   695/1459   4.48 4.28   4.16 4.17  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00     1/1480   4.98 4.83   4.68 4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 1 8 4  4.23   651/1450   4.42 4.03   4.09 4.10  4.23

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  6  8  4.57   682/1409   4.67 4.40   4.42 4.43  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80   728/1407   4.83 4.70   4.69 4.67  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  7  5  4.13   938/1399   4.38 4.05   4.26 4.27  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  0  1  4  9  4.33   791/1400   4.53 4.18   4.27 4.28  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 11 1 0 1 1 0  2.67  ****/1179   **** 3.69   3.96 4.02  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  1  1  2  0  0  2.25  1239/1262   3.20 3.20   4.05 4.14  2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   783/1259   4.46 3.65   4.29 4.34  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0  2  0  2  4.00   901/1256   4.44 3.64   4.30 4.34  4.00
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons             Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0         A   7        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major       5
 28-55     2       1.00-1.99    0         B   4
 56-83     5       2.00-2.99    1         C   3        General              2    Under-grad   16     Non-major  11
 84-150    3       3.00-3.49    1         D   0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   10         F   1        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other               12
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0201              University of Maryland                        Page  979
Title          INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I        Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    TOLL, CHARLES                Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      35
Questionnaires:  23                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                     Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  3  6 14  4.48  587/1481  4.49  4.23  4.29  4.29  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  8 14  4.57  446/1481  4.35  4.17  4.23  4.23  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  6 15  4.57  442/1249  4.53  4.39  4.27  4.28  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  3  0  1  0  8 10  4.42  533/1424  4.11  4.14  4.21  4.27  4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  5  1  2  5  5  3  3.44 1120/1396  3.59  3.83  3.98  4.00  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  6  1  0  0  4 11  4.50  303/1342  4.14  4.07  4.07  4.12  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  0  5 16  4.64  310/1459  4.48  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1 21  4.95  351/1480  4.98  4.83  4.68  4.65  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0  0  0  7 11  4.61  252/1450  4.42  4.03  4.09  4.10  4.61

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  5 17  4.77  383/1409  4.67  4.40  4.42  4.43  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  1 20  4.86  591/1407  4.83  4.70  4.69  4.67  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  8 14  4.64  417/1399  4.38  4.05  4.26  4.27  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  4 17  4.73  349/1400  4.53  4.18  4.27  4.28  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 17  1  0  2  1  1  3.20 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  4.02  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  1  0  3  3  4.14  645/1262  3.20  3.20  4.05  4.14  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  451/1259  4.46  3.65  4.29  4.34  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  240/1256  4.44  3.64  4.30  4.34  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  15  6  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  4.07  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  4.23  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2         0.00-0.99    2     A    6      Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0       Major        7
28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0     B    9                                                        
56-83      7         2.00-2.99    4     C    5      General               1     Under-grad  23       Non-major   16
84-150     6         3.00-3.49    4     D    0
Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    7     F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                19
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 302  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  980
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II          Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  KOGAN, JACOB                     Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:   8                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  844/1481  4.25  4.23  4.29  4.29  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  4  2  4.00 1000/1481  4.00  4.17  4.23  4.23  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  742/1249  4.25  4.39  4.27  4.28  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  1  1  0  2  2  3.50 1275/1424  3.50  4.14  4.21  4.27  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  1  1  2  1  3.17 1239/1396  3.17  3.83  3.98  4.00  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  1  0  0  2  2  3.80  956/1342  3.80  4.07  4.07  4.12  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  1  3  3  4.00  961/1459  4.00  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  5  2  4.29 1193/1480  4.29  4.83  4.68  4.65  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  599/1450  4.29  4.03  4.09  4.10  4.29

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29 1013/1409  4.29  4.40  4.42  4.43  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  899/1407  4.71  4.70  4.69  4.67  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  2  2  3.86 1120/1399  3.86  4.05  4.26  4.27  3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00 1017/1400  4.00  4.18  4.27  4.28  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  894/1179  3.50  3.69  3.96  4.02  3.50
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 306  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  981
Title      GEOMETRY                              Baltimore County                                 JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   CAMPBELL, ROBER                       Spring 2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  5  4  4.30   780/1481  4.30  4.23  4.29  4.29  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  2  3  3  3.70  1232/1481  3.70  4.17  4.23  4.23  3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  3  4  4.10   854/1249  4.10  4.39  4.27  4.28  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  5  3  4.10   908/1424  4.10  4.14  4.21  4.27  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  2  0  0  2  3  3  4.13   623/1396  4.13  3.83  3.98  4.00  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  2  1  3  4  3.90   884/1342  3.90  4.07  4.07  4.12  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   101/1459  4.90  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00     1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  4  3  2  3.78  1081/1450  3.78  4.03  4.09  4.10  3.78


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  3  3  4  4.10  1122/1409  4.10  4.40  4.42  4.43  4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   500/1407  4.90  4.70  4.69  4.67  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  3  3  2  2  3.30  1285/1399  3.30  4.05  4.26  4.27  3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  1  4  1  3  3.40  1256/1400  3.40  4.18  4.27  4.28  3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   177/1179  4.67  3.69  3.96  4.02  4.67


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.34  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27       0      0.00-0.99    0        A    5     Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major        9
 28-55       0      1.00-1.99    0        B    3
 56-83       0      2.00-2.99    1        C    1     General              2     Under-grad   10     Non-major    1
 84-150      6      3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.       0      3.50-4.00    4        F    0     Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0     Other                8
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 341  0101          University of Maryland                              Page  982
Title       COMPUTATIONAL METHODS          Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   ROSTAMIAN, ROUB                Spring 2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 19                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  1  3  4 11  4.32   769/1481  4.32  4.23  4.29  4.29  4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  2  4 12  4.37   704/1481  4.37  4.17  4.23  4.23  4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  3 14  4.63   369/1249  4.63  4.39  4.27  4.28  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   7  0  1  0  4  6  4.36   607/1424  4.36  4.14  4.21  4.27  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   7  0  1  1  3  5  4.20   554/1396  4.20  3.83  3.98  4.00  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  1  0  1  3  9  4.36   454/1342  4.36  4.07  4.07  4.12  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  0  4 14  4.63   310/1459  4.63  4.28  4.16  4.17  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00     1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  4  6  5  4.07   803/1450  4.07  4.03  4.09  4.10  4.07

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  1  1  6 10  4.39   913/1409  4.39  4.40  4.42  4.43  4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  2 15  4.78   785/1407  4.78  4.70  4.69  4.67  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  2  3 12  4.59   480/1399  4.59  4.05  4.26  4.27  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  0  3  4  9  4.18   929/1400  4.18  4.18  4.27  4.28  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  1  0  4  4  6  3.93   661/1179  3.93  3.69  3.96  4.02  3.93

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.34  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.34  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   15  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  4.07  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A  11      Required for Majors   1    Graduate     0      Major      11
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0      B   2                                 
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   2      C   2      General               6    Under-grad  19      Non-major   8
 84-150    13      3.00-3.49   4      D   1
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   7      F   0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other                12
                                      ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 390  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  983
Title        SPECIAL TOPICS IN MATH        Baltimore County                          JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  SURI, MANIL                      Spring 2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  9                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  2  1  1  4  1 3.11 1440/1481  3.11  4.23  4.29 4.29  3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  3  1  1  3  1 2.78 1456/1481  2.78  4.17  4.23 4.23  2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  8  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/1249  ****  4.39  4.27 4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  1  4  3  0 3.00 1361/1424  3.00  4.14  4.21 4.27  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2  2  3  1 3.11 1266/1396  3.11  3.83  3.98 4.00  3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  0  2  4  0 3.00 1269/1342  3.00  4.07  4.07 4.12  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  7  0  1  1  0 1.56 1449/1459  1.56  4.28  4.16 4.17  1.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68 4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  2  1  4  0 3.29 1299/1450  3.29  4.03  4.09 4.10  3.29

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  2  3  1  1  1 2.50 1395/1409  2.50  4.40  4.42 4.43  2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  1  0  2  5 4.38 1200/1407  4.38  4.70  4.69 4.67  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2  1  2  2  1 2.88 1350/1399  2.88  4.05  4.26 4.27  2.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  3  0  4  0  1 2.50 1364/1400  2.50  4.18  4.27 4.28  2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  2  0  1  1  3 3.43  934/1179  3.43  3.69  3.96 4.02  3.43

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  0  1  2  1 3.40 1034/1262  3.40  3.20  4.05 4.14  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  304/1259  4.80  3.65  4.29 4.34  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  2  0  0  3 3.80 1025/1256  3.80  3.64  4.30 4.34  3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  0  1  0  1  0  2 3.50  604/ 788  3.50  3.41  4.00 4.07  3.50

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 404  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  984
Title          INTRO PART DIFF EQ I        Baltimore County                             JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    BELL, JONATHAN              Spring 2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4   3   4  4.00 1069/1481  4.00  4.23  4.29  4.45  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   5   4   0  3.18 1397/1481  3.18  4.17  4.23  4.32  3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   2   4   4  4.00  893/1249  4.00  4.39  4.27  4.44  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   1   1   4   3  4.00  959/1424  4.00  4.14  4.21  4.35  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   3   2   1   1   1  2.38 1377/1396  2.38  3.83  3.98  4.09  2.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0   0   3   3   3  4.00  755/1342  4.00  4.07  4.07  4.21  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64  310/1459  4.64  4.28  4.16  4.25  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1   1   4   2   1  3.11 1340/1450  3.11  4.03  4.09  4.28  3.11


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   4   4   3  3.91 1218/1409  3.91  4.40  4.42  4.51  3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   5   5  4.36 1205/1407  4.36  4.70  4.69  4.79  4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   6   2   1   1  2.55 1378/1399  2.55  4.05  4.26  4.36  2.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   3   3   1   2  2.82 1343/1400  2.82  4.18  4.27  4.38  2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3   4   1   0   1   1  2.14 1153/1179  2.14  3.69  3.96  4.07  2.14


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   1   1   1   0  3.00 1146/1262  3.00  3.20  4.05  4.33  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   1   0   2   0   0  2.33 1234/1259  2.33  3.65  4.29  4.57  2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0   1   1   0   1  3.33 1134/1256  3.33  3.64  4.30  4.60  3.33


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0        A    3       Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major        3
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0        B    2
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99    0        C    0       General              6    Under-grad   11      Non-major    8
  84-150    5       3.00-3.49    0        D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    7        F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    2                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                3
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 407  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  985
Title       MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH         Baltimore County                                  JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  GLOOR, PHILIP                 Spring 2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 13                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62   450/1481  4.62  4.23  4.29  4.45  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1  5  6  4.23   843/1481  4.23  4.17  4.23  4.32  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46   548/1249  4.46  4.39  4.27  4.44  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   8  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   178/1424  4.80  4.14  4.21  4.35  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  0  4  2  6  4.17   584/1396  4.17  3.83  3.98  4.09  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  1  1  5  4.57   257/1342  4.57  4.07  4.07  4.21  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85   137/1459  4.85  4.28  4.16  4.25  4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  9  4  4.31  1178/1480  4.31  4.83  4.68  4.74  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  6  3  4.33   546/1450  4.33  4.03  4.09  4.28  4.33


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77   400/1409  4.77  4.40  4.42  4.51  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   400/1407  4.92  4.70  4.69  4.79  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77   256/1399  4.77  4.05  4.26  4.36  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62   480/1400  4.62  4.18  4.27  4.38  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  4.07  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.57  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.60  ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 246  ****  ****  4.20  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 249  ****  ****  4.11  3.87  ****

                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0       A    4       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      1      Major       10
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0       B    3                                  
 56-83     2       2.00-2.99   0       C    4       General              7     Under-grad   12      Non-major    3
 84-150    3       3.00-3.49   3       D    0                                  
 Grad.     1       3.50-4.00   3       F    0       Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                6
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 408  0101                    University of Maryland                                  Page  986
Title       INTRO  ABSTRACT ALGEBR                 Baltimore County                                       JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   HORTA, ARNALDO                       Spring 2006                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires:  6                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1481    5.00  4.23  4.29  4.45  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  162/1481    4.83  4.17  4.23  4.32  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  184/1249    4.83  4.39  4.27  4.44  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1424    5.00  4.14  4.21  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  2  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  297/1396    4.50  3.83  3.98  4.09  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  104/1342    4.83  4.07  4.07  4.21  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  460/1459    4.50  4.28  4.16  4.25  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1480    5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  217/1450    4.67  4.03  4.09  4.28  4.67


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  290/1409    4.83  4.40  4.42  4.51  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  659/1407    4.83  4.70  4.69  4.79  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  187/1399    4.83  4.05  4.26  4.36  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  218/1400    4.83  4.18  4.27  4.38  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1179    ****  3.69  3.96  4.07  ****


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1262    ****  3.20  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1259    ****  3.65  4.29  4.57  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1256    ****  3.64  4.30  4.60  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 409  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  987
Title         INTRO TO MATH LOGIC            Baltimore County                                   JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   ARMSTRONG, THOM                  Spring 2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires:   9                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  1  1  0  6  4.00 1069/1481  4.00 4.23  4.29 4.45  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  3  3  2  3.67 1253/1481  3.67 4.17  4.23 4.32  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  451/1249  4.56 4.39  4.27 4.44  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   4  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  217/1424  4.75 4.14  4.21 4.35  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  156/1396  4.71 3.83  3.98 4.09  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  112/1342  4.80 4.07  4.07 4.21  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  2  2  3  3.56 1242/1459  3.56 4.28  4.16 4.25  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50 1044/1480  4.50 4.83  4.68 4.74  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1  0  2  4  1  3.50 1223/1450  3.50 4.03  4.09 4.28  3.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29 1013/1409  4.29 4.40  4.42 4.51  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57 1053/1407  4.57 4.70  4.69 4.79  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  1  2  2  1  3.50 1237/1399  3.50 4.05  4.26 4.36  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  1  2  1  2  3.29 1278/1400  3.29 4.18  4.27 4.38  3.29


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1262  **** 3.20  4.05 4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1259  **** 3.65  4.29 4.57  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1256  **** 3.64  4.30 4.60  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


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

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.17	4.23	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.14	4.21	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	918/1396	3.75	3.83	3.98	4.09	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.83	4.68	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.40	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.05	4.26	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.18	4.27	4.38	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 423  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  989
Title      DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  ZWECK, JOHN                      Spring 2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires:  9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  268/1481  4.78  4.23  4.29  4.45  4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  210/1481  4.78  4.17  4.23  4.32  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  154/1249  4.89  4.39  4.27  4.44  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  959/1424  4.00  4.14  4.21  4.35  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  1  1  3  2  3.86  839/1396  3.86  3.83  3.98  4.09  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0  0  0  2  2  4.50  303/1342  4.50  4.07  4.07  4.21  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  800/1459  4.22  4.28  4.16  4.25  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  0  1  8  4.89  107/1450  4.89  4.03  4.09  4.28  4.89


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1409  5.00  4.40  4.42  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  6  3  4.33  753/1399  4.33  4.05  4.26  4.36  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  287/1400  4.78  4.18  4.27  4.38  4.78


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.57  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.60  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0        A    3        Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0         Major       6
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    3
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1        C    1        General              3      Under-grad    9         Non-major   3
  84-150     7       3.00-3.49    2        D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    4        F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                5
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 432  0101            University of Maryland                     Page  990
Title     HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS              Baltimore County                      JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  SEIDMAN, THOMAS                    Spring 2006                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires: 11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  0  2  4  4  3.91 1162/1481  3.91  4.23  4.29  4.45  3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  1  0  2  6  2  3.73 1221/1481  3.73  4.17  4.23  4.32  3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  2  3  3  3  3.64 1088/1249  3.64  4.39  4.27  4.44  3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  2  1  3  4  3.90 1087/1424  3.90  4.14  4.21  4.35  3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  0  4  2  4  3.73  942/1396  3.73  3.83  3.98  4.09  3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  4  1  3  2  3.09 1257/1342  3.09  4.07  4.07  4.21  3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  5  1  4  0  1  2.18 1436/1459  2.18  4.28  4.16  4.25  2.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  0  0  1  3  2  3  3.78 1081/1450  3.78  4.03  4.09  4.28  3.78


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  1  1  0  6  3  3.82 1236/1409  3.82  4.40  4.42  4.51  3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  0 10  4.82  705/1407  4.82  4.70  4.69  4.79  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  1  0  3  5  2  3.64 1206/1399  3.64  4.05  4.26  4.36  3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  1  1  2  2  5  3.82 1116/1400  3.82  4.18  4.27  4.38  3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  2  1  2  2  2  1  3.00 1041/1179  3.00  3.69  3.96  4.07  3.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  9  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1259  ****  3.65  4.29  4.57  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  9  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1256  ****  3.64  4.30  4.60  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons                Type               Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    3     Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major       8
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    6
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    4      C    1     General               3     Under-grad  11      Non-major   3
  84-150     9      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0     Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other                 8
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 479  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  991
Title          MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S      Baltimore County                             JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    ARMSTRONG, THOM             Spring 2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires: 10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  1  1  4  3  3.70 1283/1481  3.70  4.23  4.29  4.45  3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  2  1  3  3  1  3.00 1420/1481  3.00  4.17  4.23  4.32  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  9  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1249  ****  4.39  4.27  4.44  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  0  0  3  3  1  3.71 1207/1424  3.71  4.14  4.21  4.35  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  4  0  2  0  0  4  4.00  755/1342  4.00  4.07  4.07  4.21  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  5  1  1  2  1  0  2.60 1424/1459  2.60  4.28  4.16  4.25  2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  2  7  0  3.78 1081/1450  3.78  4.03  4.09  4.28  3.78


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       7  0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 1325/1409  3.33  4.40  4.42  4.51  3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  6  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  6  0  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 1237/1399  3.50  4.05  4.26  4.36  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    6  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  867/1400  4.25  4.18  4.27  4.38  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  7  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  4.07  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  264/1262  4.67  3.20  4.05  4.33  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  729/1259  4.33  3.65  4.29  4.57  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  7  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1256  5.00  3.64  4.30  4.60  5.00


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  2  3  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   35/ 68  4.80  4.80  4.49  4.68  4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  2  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38   49/ 69  4.38  4.38  4.53  4.64  4.38
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  2  0  1  0  1  0  6  4.25   40/ 63  4.25  4.25  4.44  4.49  4.25
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   2  0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25   42/ 69  4.25  4.25  4.35  4.53  4.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               2  0  1  3  4  0  0  2.38   61/ 68  2.38  2.38  3.92  4.10  2.38

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 481  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  992
Title          MATH MODELING                 Baltimore County                             JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    BELL, JONATHAN  (Instr. A)     Spring 2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   2   6   0  3.75 1254/1481  3.75  4.23  4.29  4.45  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   3   3   1  3.50 1320/1481  3.50  4.17  4.23  4.32  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   1   1   6   0  3.63 1236/1424  3.63  4.14  4.21  4.35  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1   1   3   1   1   0  2.33 1380/1396  2.33  3.83  3.98  4.09  2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1   0   1   4   1   0  3.00 1269/1342  3.00  4.07  4.07  4.21  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   3   3   1  3.71 1177/1459  3.71  4.28  4.16  4.25  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0   0   2   4   0  3.67 1160/1450  3.61  4.03  4.09  4.28  3.61


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  762/1409  3.96  4.40  4.42  4.51  3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75  823/1407  4.54  4.70  4.69  4.79  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   3   5   0  3.63 1210/1399  3.38  4.05  4.26  4.36  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   2   2   4  4.25  867/1400  4.03  4.18  4.27  4.38  4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  5   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 1156/1179  2.38  3.69  3.96  4.07  2.38


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  895/1259  4.00  3.65  4.29  4.57  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  901/1256  4.00  3.64  4.30  4.60  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  4.26  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 481  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  993
Title           MATH MODELING               Baltimore County                               JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     ROSTAMIAN, ROUB (Instr. B)  Spring 2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  6  0  3.75 1254/1481  3.75  4.23  4.29  4.45  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  3  3  1  3.50 1320/1481  3.50  4.17  4.23  4.32  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  6  0  3.63 1236/1424  3.63  4.14  4.21  4.35  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  1  3  1  1  0  2.33 1380/1396  2.33  3.83  3.98  4.09  2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 1  4  1  0  3.00 1269/1342  3.00  4.07  4.07  4.21  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  3  3  1  3.71 1177/1459  3.71  4.28  4.16  4.25  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0  1  4  1  4.00  836/1450  3.61  4.03  4.09  4.28  3.61


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  5  2  4.13 1110/1409  3.96  4.40  4.42  4.51  3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50 1107/1407  4.54  4.70  4.69  4.79  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  1  5  1  3.75 1163/1399  3.38  4.05  4.26  4.36  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  0  4  3  4.13  969/1400  4.03  4.18  4.27  4.38  4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 2 1  1  0  2.75 1104/1179  2.38  3.69  3.96  4.07  2.38


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  895/1259  4.00  3.65  4.29  4.57  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0  2  0  4.00  901/1256  4.00  3.64  4.30  4.60  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  4.26  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 481  0101           University of Maryland                          Page  994
Title           MATH MODELING            Baltimore County                           JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:     SEIDMAN, THOMAS (Instr. C)    Spring 2006                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  2  6  0  3.75 1254/1481  3.75  4.23  4.29  4.45  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  3  3  1  3.50 1320/1481  3.50  4.17  4.23  4.32  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  6  0  3.63 1236/1424  3.63  4.14  4.21  4.35  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  1  1  3  1  1  0  2.33 1380/1396  2.33  3.83  3.98  4.09  2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  1  0  1  4  1  0  3.00 1269/1342  3.00  4.07  4.07  4.21  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  3  3  1  3.71 1177/1459  3.71  4.28  4.16  4.25  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  0  1  0  2  3  0  3.17 1329/1450  3.61  4.03  4.09  4.28  3.61


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  1  1  1  5  0  3.25 1338/1409  3.96  4.40  4.42  4.51  3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38 1200/1407  4.54  4.70  4.69  4.79  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  1  1  5  1  0  2.75 1363/1399  3.38  4.05  4.26  4.36  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   1  0  0  4  1  2  3.71 1165/1400  4.03  4.18  4.27  4.38  4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  6  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1179  2.38  3.69  3.96  4.07  2.38


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1262  ****  3.20  4.05  4.33  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  895/1259  4.00  3.65  4.29  4.57  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  901/1256  4.00  3.64  4.30  4.60  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  4.26  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1481  5.00  4.23  4.29  4.28  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  228/1481  4.75  4.17  4.23  4.11  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1249  5.00  4.39  4.27  4.24  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1424  5.00  4.14  4.21  4.16  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  297/1396  4.50  3.83  3.98  4.00  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1342  5.00  4.07  4.07  4.18  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  460/1459  4.50  4.28  4.16  4.01  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 1215/1480  4.25  4.83  4.68  4.74  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  164/1450  4.75  4.03  4.09  3.96  4.75

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  417/1409  4.75  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  267/1399  4.75  4.05  4.26  4.16  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  312/1400  4.75  4.18  4.27  4.17  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1179  5.00  3.69  3.96  3.81  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 611  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 996
Title       APPLIED ANALYSIS                    Baltimore County                                JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  SEIDMAN, THOMAS                       Spring 2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  6                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   1   2   2  3.67 1299/1481  3.67  4.23  4.29  4.28  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   2   0   1   1   2  3.17 1401/1481  3.17  4.17  4.23  4.11  3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   0   3   1  3.50 1118/1249  3.50  4.39  4.27  4.24  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   2   0   3   1  3.50 1275/1424  3.50  4.14  4.21  4.16  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   3   0   2   1  3.17 1239/1396  3.17  3.83  3.98  4.00  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   2   2   1  3.80  956/1342  3.80  4.07  4.07  4.18  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   2   0   3  3.67 1201/1459  3.67  4.28  4.16  4.01  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  951/1480  4.67  4.83  4.68  4.74  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  1   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 1098/1450  3.75  4.03  4.09  3.96  3.75

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   1   1   1   2  3.33 1325/1409  3.33  4.40  4.42  4.36  3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   2   1   1   2   0  2.50 1381/1399  2.50  4.05  4.26  4.16  2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   0   0   3   1  3.17 1297/1400  3.17  4.18  4.27  4.17  3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 1114/1179  2.67  3.69  3.96  3.81  2.67

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   1   1   1   0   0  2.00 1245/1262  2.00  3.20  4.05  4.07  2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   2   0   1   0   0  1.67 1255/1259  1.67  3.65  4.29  4.30  1.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   1   1   1   0   0  2.00 1246/1256  2.00  3.64  4.30  4.33  2.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 614  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  997
Title      PARTIAL DIFFERENTL EQ              Baltimore County                                        JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  HOFFMAN, KATHLE                  Spring 2006                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      3
Questionnaires:  3                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1481    5.00  4.23  4.29  4.28  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1481    5.00  4.17  4.23  4.11  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  334/1249   4.67  4.39  4.27  4.24  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1424    5.00  4.14  4.21  4.16  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  193/1396   4.67  3.83  3.98  4.00  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1342    5.00  4.07  4.07  4.18  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  276/1459   4.67  4.28  4.16  4.01  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1480    5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  217/1450   4.67  4.03  4.09  3.96  4.67

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1409    5.00  4.40  4.42  4.36  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1407    5.00  4.70  4.69  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1399    5.00  4.05  4.26  4.16  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00   1/1400    5.00  4.18  4.27  4.17  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1179    5.00  3.69  3.96  3.81  5.00


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 621  0101              University of Maryland                         Page  998
Title      NUMERICAL ANALYSIS II                Baltimore County                         JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:   GOBBERT, MATTHI                     Spring 2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  4                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
        ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  749/1481  4.33  4.23  4.29  4.28  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  228/1481  4.75  4.17  4.23  4.11  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  679/1249  4.33  4.39  4.27  4.24  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1424  5.00  4.14  4.21  4.16  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  193/1396  4.67  3.83  3.98  4.00  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  190/1342  4.67  4.07  4.07  4.18  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1459  5.00  4.28  4.16  4.01  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  217/1450  4.67  4.03  4.09  3.96  4.67


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  762/1409  4.50  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 1002/1399  4.00  4.05  4.26  4.16  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  421/1400  4.67  4.18  4.27  4.17  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  177/1179  4.67  3.69  3.96  3.81  4.67


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  708/1262  4.00  3.20  4.05  4.07  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1259  5.00  3.65  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1256  5.00  3.64  4.30  4.33  5.00

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  3   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 59  5.00  5.00  4.30  4.01  5.00


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 625  0101            University of Maryland                    Page  999
Title          COMP MATH & C PROG          Baltimore County                        JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:    ROSTAMIAN, ROUB             Spring 2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       4
Questionnaires:   4             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  292/1481  4.75  4.23  4.29  4.28  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  228/1481  4.75  4.17  4.23  4.11  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  498/1249  4.50  4.39  4.27  4.24  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  217/1424  4.75  4.14  4.21  4.16  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1396  5.00  3.83  3.98  4.00  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1342  5.00  4.07  4.07  4.18  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              1   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1459  5.00  4.28  4.16  4.01  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  164/1450  4.75  4.03  4.09  3.96  4.75


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  417/1409  4.75  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  267/1399  4.75  4.05  4.26  4.16  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  312/1400  4.75  4.18  4.27  4.17  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  134/1179  4.75  3.69  3.96  3.81  4.75


                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 630  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1000
Title       MATRIX ANALYSIS                Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  MINKOFF, SUSAN                   Spring 2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  13                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   2   2   4   5  3.92 1143/1481  3.92  4.23  4.29  4.28  3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   2   1   5   4  3.69 1237/1481  3.69  4.17  4.23  4.11  3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   2   1   3   3   4  3.46 1125/1249  3.46  4.39  4.27  4.24  3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4   2   0   1   1   5  3.78 1175/1424  3.78  4.14  4.21  4.16  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1   1   1   2   3   4  3.73  942/1396  3.73  3.83  3.98  4.00  3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   1   2   5   3  3.67 1039/1342  3.67  4.07  4.07  4.18  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   2   2   8  4.31  732/1459  4.31  4.28  4.16  4.01  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0  10   3  4.23 1230/1480  4.23  4.83  4.68  4.74  4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0   1   0   3   2   3  3.67 1160/1450  3.67  4.03  4.09  3.96  3.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   2   1   0   2   7  3.92 1211/1409  3.92  4.40  4.42  4.36  3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   1   1   3   7  4.33 1221/1407  4.33  4.70  4.69  4.73  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   1   2   0   1   8  4.08  973/1399  4.08  4.05  4.26  4.16  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   2   1   1   3   5  3.67 1183/1400  3.67  4.18  4.27  4.17  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2   1   0   4   2   2  3.44  924/1179  3.44  3.69  3.96  3.81  3.44


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   2   0   1   3   3  3.56  976/1262  3.56  3.20  4.05  4.07  3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0   1   1   0   7  4.44  643/1259  4.44  3.65  4.29  4.30  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   2   0   0   3   3  3.63 1079/1256  3.63  3.64  4.30  4.33  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   3   0   1   0   1   2  4.00  394/ 788  4.00  3.41  4.00  3.97  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 650  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1001
Title        FOUNDTNS OF OPTIMIZATI        Baltimore County                            JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  GULER, OSMAN                      Spring 2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:  7                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  652/1481  4.43  4.23  4.29  4.28  4.43
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00 1000/1481  4.00  4.17  4.23  4.11  4.00
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  172/1249  4.86  4.39  4.27  4.24  4.86
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  2  0  0  3  0  2.80 1397/1424  2.80  4.14  4.21  4.16  2.80
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  3  0  3  4.00  707/1396  4.00  3.83  3.98  4.00  4.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6  4.86   99/1342  4.86  4.07  4.07  4.18  4.86
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  872/1459  4.14  4.28  4.16  4.01  4.14
 8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1480  5.00  4.83  4.68  4.74  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 2 3 1  3.83 1030/1450  3.83  4.03  4.09  3.96  3.83

              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29 1013/1409  4.29  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.29
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1407  5.00  4.70  4.69  4.73  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 2  4.00 1002/1399  4.00  4.05  4.26  4.16  4.00
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  844/1400  4.29  4.18  4.27  4.17  4.29
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/1179  ****  3.69  3.96  3.81  ****

              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 0 2 0  3.00 1146/1262  3.00  3.20  4.05  4.07  3.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 0 0 2 0  3.00 1162/1259  3.00  3.65  4.29  4.30  3.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 1 1  3.33 1134/1256  3.33  3.64  4.30  4.33  3.33
 4. Were special techniques successful                 4   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 788  ****  3.41  4.00  3.97  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 710  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1002
Title       SPEC TOPICS IN APPL MA        Baltimore County                             JUN 13, 2006
Instructor:  KOGAN, JACOB                   Spring 2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      3
Questionnaires:  3                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 1299/1481  3.67  4.23  4.29  4.28  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 1253/1481  3.67  4.17  4.23  4.11  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  645/1424  4.33  4.14  4.21  4.16  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  297/1396  4.50  3.83  3.98  4.00  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1115/1342  3.50  4.07  4.07  4.18  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 1201/1459  3.67  4.28  4.16  4.01  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  951/1480  4.67  4.83  4.68  4.74  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1160/1450  3.67  4.03  4.09  3.96  3.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  559/1409  4.67  4.40  4.42  4.36  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  963/1407  4.67  4.70  4.69  4.73  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1399  5.00  4.05  4.26  4.16  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  791/1400  4.33  4.18  4.27  4.17  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67  840/1179  3.67  3.69  3.96  3.81  3.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67  931/1262  3.67  3.20  4.05  4.07  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1067/1259  3.67  3.65  4.29  4.30  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 1069/1256  3.67  3.64  4.30  4.33  3.67


                                     Frequency Distribution

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