

Course-Section: MATH 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH
 Instructor: JONES, CRISTEN
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 953
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	9	6	2	3.24	1467/1522	3.70	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	5	4	3.19	1459/1522	3.86	4.32	4.26	4.18	3.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	938/1285	4.27	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	5	5	5	3.61	1275/1476	4.03	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	9	3	0	2.63	1377/1412	3.32	3.86	4.06	4.01	2.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	4	7	2	0	2.60	1347/1381	3.53	4.17	4.08	3.93	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	7	6	4	3	3.05	1426/1500	3.87	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	7	13	0	3.65	1480/1517	4.25	4.79	4.65	4.62	3.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	2	6	4	0	2.63	1472/1497	3.56	4.08	4.11	4.02	2.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	7	7	5	1	2.90	1418/1440	3.68	4.54	4.45	4.40	2.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	5	3	9	3	3.38	1432/1448	4.10	4.71	4.71	4.63	3.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	6	7	3	3.29	1346/1436	3.96	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	6	2	6	3.24	1338/1432	3.94	4.30	4.29	4.23	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	6	2	2	4	0	2.29	1192/1221	3.23	3.67	3.93	3.86	2.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1280	4.22	3.64	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	4.44	3.84	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1269	3.50	3.81	4.31	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 1		21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH
 Instructor: JONES, CRISTEN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 954
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1001/1522	3.70	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	511/1522	3.86	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	499/1285	4.27	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	551/1476	4.03	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	760/1412	3.32	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	382/1381	3.53	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	275/1500	3.87	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.25	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	385/1497	3.56	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	864/1440	3.68	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.10	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	446/1436	3.96	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	490/1432	3.94	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	524/1221	3.23	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	605/1280	4.22	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	652/1277	4.44	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	1117/1269	3.50	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.59	4.02	3.87	4.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 106 0101
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: CIPCIGAN, IOANA
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 955
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	3	6	12	4.08	1067/1522	4.21	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	3	17	4.42	686/1522	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	3	19	4.58	446/1285	4.68	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	566/1476	4.41	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	2	0	3	1	7	3.85	940/1412	3.98	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	806/1381	4.31	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	19	4.71	263/1500	4.66	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1517	4.74	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	769/1497	4.30	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	392/1440	4.67	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	965/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	576/1436	4.62	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	527/1432	4.71	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	279/1221	4.11	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	1	4	6	3.44	1066/1280	3.84	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	4	1	7	3.56	1122/1277	4.07	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	2	2	7	3.50	1117/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	15	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	199/ 228	3.89	3.96	4.35	4.33	3.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MATH 106 0101
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: CIPCIGAN, IOANA
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 955
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	15	14	3.95	1180/1522	4.21	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	13	19	4.21	925/1522	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	26	4.54	499/1285	4.68	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	3	0	8	8	3.95	1068/1476	4.41	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	1	2	4	8	8	3.87	924/1412	3.98	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	361/1381	4.31	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	4	8	24	4.37	670/1500	4.66	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	33	4.85	623/1517	4.74	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	2	0	2	14	9	4.04	878/1497	4.30	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	29	4.61	682/1440	4.67	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	33	4.82	737/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	12	20	4.35	772/1436	4.62	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	537/1432	4.71	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	3	3	2	2	5	3.20	1028/1221	4.11	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	7	6	9	3.76	900/1280	3.84	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	4	5	15	4.32	751/1277	4.07	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	0	4	5	10	3.74	1041/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	15	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	2	0	1	0	6	3.89	****/ 228	3.89	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MATH 106 0201
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 956
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 106 0301
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 957
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	492/1522	4.21	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	102/1522	4.51	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	120/1285	4.68	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	162/1476	4.41	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	603/1412	3.98	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	14	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	382/1381	4.31	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	98/1500	4.66	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	16	9	4.36	1193/1517	4.74	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	223/1497	4.30	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	643/1440	4.67	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	737/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1436	4.62	4.20	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	145/1432	4.71	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	10	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	194/1221	4.11	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	530/1280	3.84	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	743/1277	4.07	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	743/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	3.89	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 115 0101
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS
 Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 958
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	4	15	2	3.46	1417/1522	3.46	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	9	9	3.92	1168/1522	3.92	4.32	4.26	4.18	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	13	4.19	809/1285	4.19	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1183/1476	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	5	6	3	3.33	1257/1412	3.33	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1188/1381	3.43	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	5	12	3.96	1028/1500	3.96	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	389/1517	4.92	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	4	13	1	3.68	1192/1497	3.68	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	917/1440	4.42	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	1123/1448	4.54	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	1	6	5	7	3.55	1273/1436	3.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	8	12	4.13	977/1432	4.13	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1021/1221	3.22	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	4	3	3	3.23	1140/1280	3.23	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1129/1277	3.54	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	1	3	2	4	3.23	1179/1269	3.23	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	12	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 132 0101
 Title MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 959
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	694/1522	4.44	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1013/1412	3.75	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	953/1381	3.89	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	248/1436	4.79	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	3.84	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 150 0101
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 960
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	669/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	499/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	228/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	792/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	339/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	233/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	275/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1334/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	512/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1056/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	490/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	279/1221	3.83	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	311/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1024/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	875/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	3	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	11
			Other	3	Non-major
					11
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 150 0102
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 961
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	879/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	854/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	395/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	913/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1100/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	519/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	556/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	855/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	756/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1056/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	490/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	832/1221	3.83	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	0	6	4.00	718/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	903/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1097/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	4.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 150 0103
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 962
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	525/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1009/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	760/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	519/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	252/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1144/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	3.83	3.67	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	718/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 150 0104
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 963
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	2	7	3.73	1305/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	996/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	1	9	4.07	904/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	1188/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1100/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1016/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1111/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	952/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1105/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	946/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1056/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	775/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	727/1221	3.83	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	874/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	849/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	875/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 2	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 150 0201
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, W
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 964
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1489/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1225/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1198/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1165/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1047/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	859/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	601/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1257/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1254/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1242/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 150 0202
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 965
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	13	4.13	1022/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	7	15	4.17	965/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	554/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	1207/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	475/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	961/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	5	19	4.37	670/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	784/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	1133/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	6	19	4.47	851/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	1131/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	3	9	14	4.07	1024/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	820/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	739/1221	3.83	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	6	13	4.04	707/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	5	5	10	3.65	1097/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	4	9	9	3.96	909/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	18	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	643/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 15	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 150 0203
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 966
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1122/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	531/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	483/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1282/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1364/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1136/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	875/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	13	15	4.05	1088/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	17	13	4.03	1069/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	12	18	4.18	817/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	2	2	2	3	7	3.69	1233/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	1	2	9	9	3.96	826/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	604/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	9	22	4.26	770/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	33	4.87	577/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	7	12	14	4.15	782/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	5	29	4.61	682/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	9	26	4.58	1097/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	6	12	17	4.05	1029/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	24	4.34	811/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	26	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1004/1221	3.83	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	3	8	6	12	3.50	1031/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	7	12	6	7	3.26	1192/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	10	6	10	3.44	1133/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	23	3	1	1	4	2	3.09	771/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.09	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	19	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 38 Non-major 37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 7	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 30	
			? 2		

Course-Section: MATH 150 0205
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 968
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	4.00	1122/1522	4.02	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1458/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.18	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1065/1285	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.22	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1363/1476	3.96	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1165/1412	4.01	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	806/1381	4.15	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1405/1500	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1458/1497	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.02	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1304/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1353/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1282/1436	4.03	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	3.83	3.67	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	874/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	930/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	875/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	673/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4	3.89	1229/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	787/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	787/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1198/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1257/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	1099/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1204/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	740/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1001/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	995/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	984/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	759/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	834/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1020/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	968/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	588/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0102
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: GURTUNA, FILIZ
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 969
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	11	4.35	791/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	686/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	509/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	961/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	964/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	633/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	585/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	341/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	525/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	240/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	575/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	207/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	280/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	430/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	849/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1031/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1053/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	841/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	2.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	10	4.43	707/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	763/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	456/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	827/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	760/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1046/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	1	0	10	4.23	799/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	749/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	846/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	798/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	1097/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	514/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	632/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	739/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	934/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	3	2	2	4	3.07	1210/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	3	2	3	4	3.29	1167/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	747/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0301
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 972
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	837/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	334/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	566/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	815/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	0	3	6	4.00	760/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	663/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	287/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	911/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	769/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	115/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	521/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	467/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	558/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1165/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	324/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	885/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	6	1	6	3.79	1013/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	

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	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	6	4.07	1081/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	914/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	745/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1302/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1037/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	733/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	750/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	457/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	353/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1072/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	564/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	682/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	408/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	7	2	4	3.40	1081/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	5	2	5	3.53	1129/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1172/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	816/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0302
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 973
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 151 0401
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 974
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	3.92	1200/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	1	6	4.00	1080/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	898/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	792/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	339/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	434/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1223/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1246/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	917/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1232/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1185/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	745/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	727/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	5	6	4.00	718/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1109/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	985/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 151 0402
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 975
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	8	6	3.75	1295/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	8	12	4.17	965/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	11	4.13	865/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1198/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1143/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	331/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	871/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	555/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	5	11	4	3.65	1210/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	5	16	4.42	917/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	19	4.71	954/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	11	10	4.21	927/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	569/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	556/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	2	11	6	3.63	978/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	4	7	8	3.71	1082/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	10	10	4.21	812/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.21	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	5	24	4.83	232/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	89/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	181/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	473/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	2	1	3	7	9	3.91	892/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	482/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	435/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	820/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	142/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	320/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	198/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	132/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	174/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	2	1	1	2	7	3.85	733/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	424/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	672/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	637/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	413/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	4.10	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 9			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 30	Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	23
?	1		

Course-Section: MATH 151 0602
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 977
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	18	4.77	290/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	233/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	415/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	582/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	5	4	5	3.63	1100/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	673/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	650/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	873/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	206/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	432/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	765/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	539/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	418/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	459/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	9	10	4.29	781/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	611/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	17	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0702
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 978
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	869/1522	4.26	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	787/1522	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	2	14	4.33	706/1285	4.41	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1009/1476	4.08	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	603/1412	3.87	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	168/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	3	11	4.10	935/1500	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	487/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	433/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	272/1440	4.70	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	1029/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	707/1432	4.55	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	832/1221	3.81	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	4	8	1	2	2.63	1253/1280	3.86	3.64	4.10	3.92	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	3	2	4	6	3.26	1192/1277	3.78	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	3	2	2	9	3.58	1103/1269	3.85	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	16	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	3.26	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	2	11	4.11	1054/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	11	4.11	1027/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	8	3.89	1030/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	4	1	3	4	3.38	1353/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	715/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	758/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	819/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	532/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	769/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	208/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	1182/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	1117/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	13	4.37	793/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	850/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	286/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	743/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	875/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	391/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MATH 152 0101
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 979
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0102
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 980
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	4.09	1060/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	750/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	308/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	850/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	833/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	192/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	737/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	942/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1036/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	606/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	1234/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	2	4	0	2	2.64	1262/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	2.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1133/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.44	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 152 0201
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 981
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	4	4.07	1074/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	986/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	531/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1174/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1385/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	806/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	750/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	852/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	802/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	845/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	802/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	759/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	4	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	789/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1097/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	426/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0202
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 982
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.13	1033/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	738/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	865/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1159/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	0	2	2	3.43	1213/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	806/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	483/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	147/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	524/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	657/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1119/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1103/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	17	4.76	305/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	201/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	75/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	671/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1077/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	693/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	160/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	172/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	765/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	217/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	227/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	967/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	4	1	3	2.63	1254/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	4	2	4	4	3.25	1193/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	6	1	5	3.25	1174/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 152 0302
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 984
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	350/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	358/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	456/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	473/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1201/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	272/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	312/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	341/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	312/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	134/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	897/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	326/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	294/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	500/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1164/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	2	3	0	4	2.85	1248/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	2.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1074/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	1
				Other	12
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	15
				Major	0
				Non-major	15
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: MATH 152 0401
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 985
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	4.55	559/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	128/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1100/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	693/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	457/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	192/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	207/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	280/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	1165/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1150/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	1136/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	853/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 152 0402
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 986
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.40	733/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	432/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	629/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	680/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	275/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	487/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	622/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1157/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	601/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	632/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1009/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1124/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	1019/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	817/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	2.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 152 0501
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 987
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	414/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	222/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	157/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	703/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	585/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	743/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	242/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	509/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	264/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	208/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	656/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	326/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	240/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	759/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	8	6	3.89	834/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	743/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	637/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	726/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 152 0502
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 988
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	21	4.59	514/1522	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	371/1522	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	278/1285	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	336/1476	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	511/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	331/1381	4.20	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	435/1500	4.56	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	749/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	147/1497	4.47	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	372/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	602/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	425/1436	4.55	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	25	4.79	305/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	803/1221	3.69	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	2	8	8	3.74	920/1280	3.48	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	699/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.13	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	3	8	9	3.91	951/1269	3.78	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	625/ 854	3.59	3.59	4.02	3.87	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 29 Non-major 29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4	23	4.48	630/1522	4.07	4.25	4.30	4.14	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	21	4.63	407/1522	4.12	4.32	4.26	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	308/1285	4.35	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	682/1476	3.72	4.15	4.22	4.09	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	734/1412	3.93	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	3	8	9	4.14	713/1381	3.97	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	10	20	4.48	512/1500	4.22	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1517	4.96	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	3	11	9	4.17	756/1497	3.90	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	412/1440	4.48	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	878/1448	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	7	23	4.68	404/1436	3.92	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	514/1432	3.97	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	606/1221	3.35	3.67	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	3	2	3	10	3.80	874/1280	3.43	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	7	1	8	3.63	1103/1277	3.48	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	2	4	3	8	3.68	1066/1269	3.47	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	12	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 33	Non-major 33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 22		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	11	6	3.96	1171/1522	4.07	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	6	9	3.91	1179/1522	4.12	4.32	4.26	4.18	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	698/1285	4.35	4.41	4.30	4.22	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	3	4	5	3	3.38	1355/1476	3.72	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	760/1412	3.93	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	806/1381	3.97	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	8	10	4.09	945/1500	4.22	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1517	4.96	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	8	5	3.85	1073/1497	3.90	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	774/1440	4.48	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	1001/1448	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1158/1436	3.92	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	995/1432	3.97	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	983/1221	3.35	3.67	3.93	3.86	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	4	1	3	5	3.69	945/1280	3.43	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1174/1277	3.48	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1103/1269	3.47	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 990
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	5	4	10	8	3.78	1284/1522	4.07	4.25	4.30	4.14	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	6	10	3.81	1238/1522	4.12	4.32	4.26	4.18	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	5	12	3.96	973/1285	4.35	4.41	4.30	4.22	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	2	0	5	7	2	3.44	1341/1476	3.72	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1029/1412	3.93	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1040/1381	3.97	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	7	12	4.07	950/1500	4.22	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	555/1517	4.96	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	5	11	2	3.68	1192/1497	3.90	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	9	12	4.15	1118/1440	4.48	4.54	4.45	4.40	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	7	15	4.31	1284/1448	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	7	9	4	5	3.19	1359/1436	3.92	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	12	5	4	3.19	1345/1432	3.97	4.30	4.29	4.23	3.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1142/1221	3.35	3.67	3.93	3.86	2.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	2	5	3	2	2.81	1234/1280	3.43	3.64	4.10	3.92	2.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1164/1277	3.48	3.84	4.34	4.13	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	0	5	4	2	3.14	1197/1269	3.47	3.81	4.31	4.04	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MATH 155 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 991
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	11	0	3.22	1470/1522	3.22	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	13	6	2	3.35	1417/1522	3.35	4.32	4.26	4.29	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	658/1285	4.39	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.39		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1145/1476	3.87	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	852/1412	3.93	3.86	4.06	4.00	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1070/1381	3.71	4.17	4.08	3.97	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	7	6	3.61	1262/1500	3.61	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	1	16	4	0	3.05	1505/1517	3.05	4.79	4.65	4.63	3.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	13	5	0	3.28	1364/1497	3.28	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	9	6	3.95	1219/1440	3.95	4.54	4.45	4.42	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	6	8	7	3.95	1369/1448	3.95	4.71	4.71	4.78	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	10	7	2	3.32	1340/1436	3.32	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	8	10	2	3.57	1251/1432	3.57	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1053/1221	3.10	3.67	3.93	4.02	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	978/1280	3.63	3.64	4.10	4.08	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1066/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.33	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1117/1269	3.50	3.81	4.31	4.33	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: MATH 215 0201
 Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S
 Instructor: VANCEA, ADRIAN
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 992
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0101
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 993
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	643/1522	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	477/1522	4.36	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	509/1285	4.43	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	357/1476	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	430/1412	4.16	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	519/1381	4.17	4.17	4.08	3.97	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	463/1500	4.33	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	911/1517	4.88	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	2	8	7	3.95	966/1497	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	320/1440	4.37	4.54	4.45	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	1013/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	825/1436	4.04	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	1036/1432	3.90	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.67	3.93	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1081/1280	3.44	3.64	4.10	4.08	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1258/1277	3.21	3.84	4.34	4.33	2.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	2	0	3	2	2.90	1231/1269	3.44	3.81	4.31	4.33	2.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0201
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 994
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	6	9	3.77	1289/1522	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	11	7	3.81	1244/1522	4.36	4.32	4.26	4.29	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	13	4.15	841/1285	4.43	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	2	6	6	3	3.32	1367/1476	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	8	5	4	3.58	1127/1412	4.16	3.86	4.06	4.00	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1046/1381	4.17	4.17	4.08	3.97	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	5	7	8	3.75	1183/1500	4.33	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	8	7	5	3.68	1192/1497	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	8	7	9	3.96	1212/1440	4.37	4.54	4.45	4.42	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	989/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	9	7	6	3.60	1261/1436	4.04	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	6	9	5	3.48	1277/1432	3.90	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1221	3.50	3.67	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	1133/1280	3.44	3.64	4.10	4.08	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1193/1277	3.21	3.84	4.34	4.33	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1030/1269	3.44	3.81	4.31	4.33	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 221 0301
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: LO, JAMES T
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 995
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	13	4.20	959/1522	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	477/1522	4.36	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	425/1285	4.43	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	682/1476	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	265/1412	4.16	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	623/1381	4.17	4.17	4.08	3.97	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	300/1500	4.33	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1517	4.88	4.79	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	6	10	8	4.00	898/1497	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	961/1440	4.37	4.54	4.45	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	840/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	8	12	4.20	934/1436	4.04	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	914/1432	3.90	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1221	3.50	3.67	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	959/1280	3.44	3.64	4.10	4.08	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1094/1277	3.21	3.84	4.34	4.33	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1074/1269	3.44	3.81	4.31	4.33	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1 Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 221 0401
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: LO, JAMES T
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 996
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	11	12	4.10	1054/1522	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	9	19	4.50	545/1522	4.36	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	6	20	4.43	614/1285	4.43	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	1009/1476	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	9	5	10	4.04	734/1412	4.16	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	495/1381	4.17	4.17	4.08	3.97	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	19	4.39	650/1500	4.33	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	195/1517	4.88	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	6	10	9	3.86	1073/1497	3.87	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	9	16	4.34	976/1440	4.37	4.54	4.45	4.42	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	859/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	5	6	15	4.07	1024/1436	4.04	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	8	6	12	3.90	1130/1432	3.90	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	23	0	3	0	1	2	3.33	****/1221	3.50	3.67	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1280	3.44	3.64	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1277	3.21	3.84	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1269	3.44	3.81	4.31	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	25
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 225 0101
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT
 Instructor: GULER, OSMAN
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 997
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	15	13	3.85	1244/1522	3.98	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	12	15	7	3.49	1372/1522	3.85	4.32	4.26	4.29	3.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	14	12	3.80	1065/1285	4.02	4.41	4.30	4.36	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	8	5	7	3.09	1410/1476	3.48	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	3	2	5	3	8	3.52	1154/1412	3.53	3.86	4.06	4.00	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	9	5	7	10	5	2.92	1313/1381	3.32	4.17	4.08	3.97	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	8	11	15	3.78	1161/1500	4.05	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	38	4.90	509/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	5	6	15	8	0	2.76	1456/1497	3.40	4.08	4.11	4.11	2.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	6	7	12	13	3.70	1322/1440	4.10	4.54	4.45	4.42	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	3	17	17	4.26	1300/1448	4.37	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	9	7	9	9	4	2.79	1404/1436	3.48	4.20	4.29	4.29	2.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	11	4	12	3	9	2.87	1384/1432	3.45	4.30	4.29	4.31	2.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	30	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	****/1221	3.34	3.67	3.93	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	9	C	12	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	39
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	9	11	3.90	1220/1522	3.98	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	11	8	3.73	1276/1522	3.85	4.32	4.26	4.29	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	13	6	3.63	1132/1285	4.02	4.41	4.30	4.36	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	5	10	8	4	3.41	1349/1476	3.48	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	4	5	2	2	6	3.05	1323/1412	3.53	3.86	4.06	4.00	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	5	5	5	3.27	1244/1381	3.32	4.17	4.08	3.97	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	10	9	3.73	1197/1500	4.05	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	973/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	4	9	6	5	3.40	1325/1497	3.40	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	8	9	12	4.03	1174/1440	4.10	4.54	4.45	4.42	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	1	9	17	4.33	1271/1448	4.37	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	5	8	9	3.62	1254/1436	3.48	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	5	8	11	3.70	1212/1432	3.45	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	22	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1152/1221	3.34	3.67	3.93	4.02	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	5	1	0	1	2	2.33	1267/1280	2.33	3.64	4.10	4.08	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1206/1277	3.13	3.84	4.34	4.33	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1242/1269	2.75	3.81	4.31	4.33	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B 14			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 30	Non-major 26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 23		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MATH 225 0301
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT
 Instructor: DRAGANESCU, AND
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 999
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	15	16	4.18	970/1522	3.98	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	9	21	4.32	811/1522	3.85	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	28	4.63	395/1285	4.02	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	13	8	13	3.94	1079/1476	3.48	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	8	6	10	4.00	760/1412	3.53	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	4	5	8	12	3.77	1034/1381	3.32	4.17	4.08	3.97	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	27	4.62	362/1500	4.05	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	146/1517	4.83	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	8	14	9	4.03	878/1497	3.40	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	8	26	4.58	716/1440	4.10	4.54	4.45	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	9	25	4.53	1140/1448	4.37	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	7	9	18	4.03	1045/1436	3.48	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	7	10	15	3.79	1178/1432	3.45	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	3	3	13	14	4.06	589/1221	3.34	3.67	3.93	4.02	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/1280	2.33	3.64	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1277	3.13	3.84	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1269	2.75	3.81	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	34
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0101
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1000
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	970/1522	4.08	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	1157/1522	3.72	4.32	4.26	4.29	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	817/1285	3.85	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1281/1476	3.50	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	964/1412	3.67	3.86	4.06	4.00	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	953/1381	3.69	4.17	4.08	3.97	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	850/1500	3.83	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	994/1517	4.78	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	3	6	1	3.14	1400/1497	3.13	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1047/1440	4.01	4.54	4.45	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1375/1448	4.30	4.71	4.71	4.78	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1269/1436	3.38	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	6	3.69	1218/1432	3.48	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1188/1221	2.33	3.67	3.93	4.02	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1066/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.33	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	

Course-Section: MATH 251 0101
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1000
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0201
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1001
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	8	4.06	1088/1522	4.08	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1200/1522	3.72	4.32	4.26	4.29	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	690/1285	3.85	4.41	4.30	4.36	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1009/1476	3.50	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	760/1412	3.67	3.86	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	753/1381	3.69	4.17	4.08	3.97	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	961/1500	3.83	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	691/1517	4.78	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	4	3	6	1	3.29	1361/1497	3.13	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1136/1440	4.01	4.54	4.45	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	1319/1448	4.30	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	2	6	3	3.38	1323/1436	3.38	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1294/1432	3.48	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1221	2.33	3.67	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 17 Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	8	15	4.00	1122/1522	4.08	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	11	8	6	3.34	1417/1522	3.72	4.32	4.26	4.29	3.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	5	9	7	5	3.00	1248/1285	3.85	4.41	4.30	4.36	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	5	3	5	1	5	2.89	1434/1476	3.50	4.15	4.22	4.20	2.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	4	4	4	5	3.20	1302/1412	3.67	3.86	4.06	4.00	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	2	3	3	0	4	3.08	1281/1381	3.69	4.17	4.08	3.97	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	6	2	8	8	7	3.26	1396/1500	3.83	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	341/1517	4.78	4.79	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	2	6	8	5	2	2.96	1428/1497	3.13	4.08	4.11	4.11	2.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	8	16	4	3.65	1335/1440	4.01	4.54	4.45	4.42	3.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	27	4.77	821/1448	4.30	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	8	8	8	5	3.19	1359/1436	3.38	4.20	4.29	4.29	3.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	4	8	8	7	3.32	1322/1432	3.48	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	10	6	5	4	2	2.33	1188/1221	2.33	3.67	3.93	4.02	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/1277	3.75	3.84	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: MATH 251 0301
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH
 Enrollment: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1002
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 10	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 33 Non-major 32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 2	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 3		

Course-Section: MATH 301 0101
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1003
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4	8	4.43	707/1522	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	844/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	745/1285	4.31	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1141/1476	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.26	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	2.77	1366/1412	3.61	3.86	4.06	4.03	2.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1097/1381	4.07	4.17	4.08	4.13	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	819/1500	4.14	4.30	4.18	4.13	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.95	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	674/1497	4.10	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	716/1440	4.58	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1060/1448	4.68	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	1018/1436	3.98	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	732/1432	4.18	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1221	4.40	3.67	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	3.13	3.64	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	4.42	3.84	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	3.67	3.81	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	2.40	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 301 0201
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: SURI, MANIL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1004
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	4.50	605/1522	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	222/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	386/1285	4.31	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	815/1476	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	566/1412	3.61	3.86	4.06	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	297/1381	4.07	4.17	4.08	4.13	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	252/1500	4.14	4.30	4.18	4.13	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	4.95	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	189/1497	4.10	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1440	4.58	4.54	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1448	4.68	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	383/1436	3.98	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	514/1432	4.18	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	359/1221	4.40	3.67	3.93	3.94	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1133/1280	3.13	3.64	4.10	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	594/1277	4.42	3.84	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	875/1269	3.67	3.81	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	844/ 854	2.40	3.59	4.02	4.00	2.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 301 0301
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1005
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	2	3.50	1402/1522	4.14	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1365/1522	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.25	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	938/1285	4.31	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1009/1476	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	973/1412	3.61	3.86	4.06	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.07	4.17	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1298/1500	4.14	4.30	4.18	4.13	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	4.95	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1346/1497	4.10	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1112/1440	4.58	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1448	4.68	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1364/1436	3.98	4.20	4.29	4.30	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1270/1432	4.18	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1221	4.40	3.67	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.13	3.64	4.10	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1277	4.42	3.84	4.34	4.38	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1156/1269	3.67	3.81	4.31	4.39	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 302 0101
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II
 Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1006
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1285	4.86	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.80	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1257/1412	3.33	3.86	4.06	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.30	4.18	4.13	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1436	4.29	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	394/1432	4.71	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	3.67	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1280	4.50	3.64	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.84	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.81	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	3.59	4.02	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 306 0101
 Title GEOMETRY
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1007
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1522	4.56	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	488/1522	4.56	4.32	4.26	4.25	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	366/1285	4.67	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	339/1412	4.50	3.86	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.17	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1099/1500	3.89	4.30	4.18	4.13	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1057/1497	3.88	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	672/1436	4.44	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.67	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	3.64	4.10	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	3.84	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	461/1269	4.67	3.81	4.31	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 341 0101
 Title COMPUTATIONAL METHODS
 Instructor: DRAGANESCU, AND
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1008
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	4.13	1033/1522	4.13	4.25	4.30	4.34	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1157/1522	3.94	4.32	4.26	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	674/1285	4.38	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	961/1476	4.09	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	6	1	1	2.91	1351/1412	2.91	3.86	4.06	4.03	2.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	924/1381	3.92	4.17	4.08	4.13	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	287/1500	4.69	4.30	4.18	4.13	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	11	1	3.80	1113/1497	3.80	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	728/1440	4.56	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1169/1436	3.88	4.20	4.29	4.30	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	714/1221	3.88	3.67	3.93	3.94	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1081/1280	3.40	3.64	4.10	4.14	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.40	3.84	4.34	4.38	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	816/1269	4.20	3.81	4.31	4.39	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 404 0101
 Title INTRO PART DIFF EQ I
 Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1009
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	14	4.65	453/1522	4.65	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	454/1522	4.59	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	446/1285	4.59	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	2	6	2	3.36	1248/1412	3.36	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	392/1381	4.44	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	740/1500	4.29	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	224/1440	4.88	4.54	4.45	4.52	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	835/1436	4.29	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	548/1432	4.59	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	950/1221	3.42	3.67	3.93	4.04	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1277	****	3.84	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 407 0101
 Title MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH
 Instructor: ROBERTS, JOEL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1010
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	514/1522	4.59	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	186/1522	4.82	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	165/1285	4.88	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	151/1476	4.86	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	646/1412	4.17	3.86	4.06	4.11	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	240/1381	4.62	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	463/1500	4.53	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	432/1440	4.76	4.54	4.45	4.52	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	548/1448	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	373/1436	4.71	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	611/1432	4.53	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1221	****	3.67	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1106/1280	3.33	3.64	4.10	4.28	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1094/1277	3.67	3.84	4.34	4.50	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	989/1269	3.83	3.81	4.31	4.49	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 17	Non-major 7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 2			

Course-Section: MATH 408 0101
 Title INTRO ABSTRACT ALGEBR
 Instructor: TOLL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1011
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	339/1412	4.50	3.86	4.06	4.11	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.30	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	147/1497	4.80	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.54	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.34	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.84	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 413 0101
 Title NUMBER THEORY
 Instructor: HORTA, ARNALDO
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1012
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	225/1522	4.83	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1285	4.83	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	****	3.86	4.06	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.40

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.54	4.45	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.80

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 432 0101
 Title HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1013
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	3	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1281/1476	3.60	4.15	4.22	4.31	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	973/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1016/1381	3.80	4.17	4.08	4.21	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1458/1500	2.75	4.30	4.18	4.25	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1301/1517	4.20	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1287/1440	3.80	4.54	4.45	4.52	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1315/1436	3.40	4.20	4.29	4.32	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1243/1432	3.60	4.30	4.29	4.34	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1165/1221	2.50	3.67	3.93	4.04	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1133/1280	3.25	3.64	4.10	4.28	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	3.84	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1030/1269	3.75	3.81	4.31	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.59	4.02	4.31	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 452 0101
 Title INTRO STOCHASTIC PROCE
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1014
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	578/1285	4.47	4.41	4.30	4.42	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1320/1412	3.08	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	992/1381	3.83	4.17	4.08	4.21	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	454/1500	4.53	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	577/1517	4.87	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	280/1497	4.64	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	669/1440	4.62	4.54	4.45	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1448	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	708/1436	4.42	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	682/1432	4.46	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.67	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1277	****	3.84	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 479 0101
 Title MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1015
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1284/1522	3.78	4.25	4.30	4.42	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1016/1522	4.11	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1285	****	4.41	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.86	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1236/1500	3.67	4.30	4.18	4.25	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1284/1517	4.22	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1057/1497	3.88	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1287/1440	3.80	4.54	4.45	4.52	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1072/1448	4.60	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1197/1436	3.80	4.20	4.29	4.32	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1344/1432	3.20	4.30	4.29	4.34	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.67	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	3.64	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.84	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.49	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101
 Title MATH MODELING
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1016
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	738/1522	4.38	4.32	4.26	4.34	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	7	3	4	3.44	1207/1412	3.44	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	187/1381	4.69	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	956/1500	4.06	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1307/1517	4.19	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	341/1497	4.56	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.20	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	200/1221	4.63	3.67	3.93	4.04	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	988/1280	3.60	3.64	4.10	4.28	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	930/1277	4.00	3.84	4.34	4.50	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1097/1269	3.60	3.81	4.31	4.49	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.92	****	

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101
 Title MATH MODELING
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1016
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 482 0101
 Title NONLINEAR OPTIMIZATION
 Instructor: GULER, OSMAN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1017
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1396/1522	3.43	4.32	4.26	4.34	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1046/1285	3.86	4.41	4.30	4.42	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1476	****	4.15	4.22	4.31	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	3.86	4.06	4.11	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1272/1500	3.57	4.30	4.18	4.25	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1318/1440	3.71	4.54	4.45	4.52	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1378/1436	3.00	4.20	4.29	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1348/1432	3.17	4.30	4.29	4.34	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	3.67	3.93	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 485 0101
 Title INTRO CALC OF VARIATIO
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1018
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	3.86	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.30	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.54	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.67	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	3.64	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.84	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.81	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.59	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 490 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN MATH
 Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1019
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.67	3.86	4.06	4.11	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.30	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.54	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	408/1221	4.33	3.67	3.93	4.04	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	3.64	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.84	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.81	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	832/ 854	2.50	3.59	4.02	4.31	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	213/ 215	3.00	3.00	4.36	4.47	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	3.96	4.35	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.55	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	205/ 205	1.00	1.00	4.23	3.85	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.67	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.33	4.52	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.75	4.49	4.65	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.58	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 80	4.00	3.75	4.11	4.14	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.17	4.41	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.22	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.11	4.40	4.03	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.13	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.11	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.50	4.63	4.33	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	15/ 23	4.00	3.83	4.41	4.00	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.28	4.69	4.92	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.25	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 18	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.25	5.00	

Course-Section: MATH 490 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN MATH
 Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1019
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	3	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 611 0101
 Title APPLIED ANALYSIS
 Instructor: GOWDA, MUDDAPPA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1020
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	258/1285	4.78	4.41	4.30	4.31	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	566/1476	4.44	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	339/1412	4.50	3.86	4.06	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	604/1381	4.25	4.17	4.08	4.25	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	190/1500	4.78	4.30	4.18	4.22	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.54	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	141/1436	4.89	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1133/1280	3.25	3.64	4.10	4.24	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	804/1277	4.25	3.84	4.34	4.52	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	875/1269	4.00	3.81	4.31	4.51	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.17	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.17	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.40	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.83	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.28	4.69	4.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 630 0101
 Title MATRIX ANALYSIS
 Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1021
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.45	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	670/1522	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.41	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	299/1412	4.57	3.86	4.06	4.25	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.25	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.30	4.18	4.22	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1251/1517	4.29	4.79	4.65	4.73	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	756/1497	4.17	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.54	4.45	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	629/1448	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	213/1221	4.60	3.67	3.93	3.83	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	657/1280	4.14	3.64	4.10	4.24	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.71	3.84	4.34	4.52	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	654/1269	4.43	3.81	4.31	4.51	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	3.59	4.02	4.08	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	3.96	4.35	4.39	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	4.33	4.52	4.70	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 65	4.50	4.75	4.49	4.71	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	62/ 80	3.50	3.75	4.11	4.38	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	34/ 47	4.00	4.17	4.41	4.40	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 45	4.50	4.17	4.30	4.49	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.11	4.40	4.78	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 37	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.82	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	20/ 23	3.50	3.83	4.41	4.68	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	31/ 33	3.50	4.28	4.69	4.79	3.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: MATH 630 0101
 Title MATRIX ANALYSIS
 Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1021
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 650 0101
 Title FOUNDTNS OF OPTIMIZATI
 Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1022
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1244/1522	3.86	4.25	4.30	4.45	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	986/1522	4.14	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	626/1285	4.43	4.41	4.30	4.31	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	948/1412	3.83	3.86	4.06	4.25	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	413/1381	4.43	4.17	4.08	4.25	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	134/1500	4.86	4.30	4.18	4.22	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.79	4.65	4.73	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1023/1440	4.29	4.54	4.45	4.48	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1097/1448	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1177/1436	3.86	4.20	4.29	4.37	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1207/1432	3.71	4.30	4.29	4.33	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.67	3.93	3.83	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1133/1280	3.25	3.64	4.10	4.24	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	3.84	4.34	4.52	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1030/1269	3.75	3.81	4.31	4.51	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	3.00	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	3.96	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	1.00	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	4.33	4.52	4.70	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.75	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	42/ 47	3.50	4.17	4.41	4.40	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.49	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	26/ 39	4.33	4.11	4.40	4.78	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	31/ 37	4.00	4.50	4.63	4.82	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	15/ 23	4.00	3.83	4.41	4.68	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	28/ 33	4.33	4.28	4.69	4.79	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	5.00	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: MATH 650 0101
 Title FOUNDTNS OF OPTIMIZATI
 Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1022
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
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	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 710A 0101
 Title DATA ASSIMILATION
 Instructor: TANGBORN, ANDRE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1023
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.86	4.06	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.17	4.08	4.25	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.30	4.18	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.54	4.45	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	3.64	4.10	4.24	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1277	4.50	3.84	4.34	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	3.81	4.31	4.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
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	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 710B 0101
 Title INTERIOR POINT METHODS
 Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1024
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.25	4.30	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.80	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1160/1285	3.50	4.41	4.30	4.31	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	973/1412	3.80	3.86	4.06	4.25	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.30	4.18	4.22	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.54	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	3.67	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	3.64	4.10	4.24	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.84	4.34	4.52	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	3.81	4.31	4.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 710D 0101
 Title CONTINUUM MECHANICS
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1025
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.41	4.30	4.31	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	646/1412	4.17	3.86	4.06	4.25	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.17	4.08	4.25	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.30	4.18	4.22	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.79	4.65	4.73	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.54	4.45	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.20	4.29	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.67	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1257/1280	2.50	3.64	4.10	4.24	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1183/1277	3.33	3.84	4.34	4.52	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1156/1269	3.33	3.81	4.31	4.51	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.59	4.02	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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