

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	13	8	1	3.15	1471/1528	3.25	4.18	4.31	4.16	3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	11	4	3.62	1369/1527	3.43	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	11	3.92	1070/1333	3.92	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	6	6	5	3.60	1331/1495	3.63	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	980/1439	3.51	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1262/1425	3.44	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	5	14	4.12	959/1508	3.62	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	601/1526	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	2	11	7	0	3.14	1387/1490	3.28	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.14
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	6	9	7	3.80	1298/1428	3.64	4.43	4.49	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	4	15	4.36	1277/1436	4.52	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	6	11	3	3.40	1329/1427	3.27	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	4	10	7	3.91	1148/1425	3.70	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	2	0	3	4	1	3.20	1160/1291	3.31	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1108/1271	3.24	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	6	2	4	3.50	1152/1276	3.50	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	920/1273	4.04	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	839/922	3.15	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Kogan, Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	17	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	4	7	10	8	3.35	1443/1528	3.25	4.18	4.31	4.16	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	10	6	8	3.24	1456/1527	3.43	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	3	4	7	16	3.91	1087/1333	3.92	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	7	9	10	3.66	1306/1495	3.63	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	6	10	7	6	3.15	1340/1439	3.51	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	11	10	7	3.47	1226/1425	3.44	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	3	8	7	8	3.12	1410/1508	3.62	4.30	4.18	4.11	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	24	10	4.29	1248/1526	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	3	0	11	9	4	3.41	1313/1490	3.28	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.41
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	5	6	8	9	3.48	1366/1428	3.64	4.43	4.49	4.43	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	2	26	4.68	1031/1436	4.52	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	6	7	8	5	3.13	1364/1427	3.27	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	5	6	5	10	3.48	1309/1425	3.70	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	2	2	4	0	6	3.43	1086/1291	3.31	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.43
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	8	5	4	3.04	1192/1271	3.24	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	4	5	2	10	3.50	1152/1276	3.50	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	3	5	5	11	4.00	947/1273	4.04	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	3	4	3	3	5	3.17	833/922	3.15	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.17

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	5	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General	21	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	983/1528	3.98	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	13	4.35	795/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	14	4.33	769/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1047/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	851/1439	3.56	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	249/1425	4.16	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	2	16	4.43	558/1508	4.25	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	968/1526	4.54	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	281/1490	4.18	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	572/1428	4.54	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	3	14	4.45	1221/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	625/1427	4.41	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	667/1425	4.38	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	993/1291	3.71	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	858/1271	3.63	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	926/1276	3.74	3.60	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	947/1273	3.88	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/922	3.99	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	4.63	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/208	4.62	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	4.63	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	4.63	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	4.72	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	5 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	9 Under-grad 21 Non-major 21

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	21

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

84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	2									
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		2						
				?	5									



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	9	15	4.46	687/1528	3.98	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	489/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	447/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	808/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	2	7	6	3.68	1117/1439	3.56	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	613/1425	4.16	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	503/1508	4.25	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	978/1526	4.54	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	464/1490	4.18	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	253/1428	4.54	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	1055/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	435/1427	4.41	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	378/1425	4.38	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1093/1291	3.71	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	1	6	5	3.50	1077/1271	3.63	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	1	7	4	3.56	1137/1276	3.74	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	1092/1273	3.88	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/922	3.99	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	4.63	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/208	4.62	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	4.63	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	4.63	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	4.72	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	6
			Required for Majors	8	Graduate
				0	Major
					0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11									
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		11	Under-grad	26	Non-major		26	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	2									
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		0						
				?	5									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Ehrhardt,Kriste

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	9	6	20	4.03	1127/1528	3.98	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	8	23	4.31	853/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	7	26	4.46	620/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	1	2	6	14	4.29	796/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1203/1439	3.56	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	816/1425	4.16	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	13	17	4.08	995/1508	4.25	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	2	30	6	4.05	1407/1526	4.54	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	4	13	13	4.06	871/1490	4.18	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.06
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	4	7	21	4.38	981/1428	4.54	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	8	23	4.56	1148/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	4	8	20	4.35	823/1427	4.41	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	6	22	4.38	830/1425	4.38	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	1	1	0	9	12	4.30	504/1291	3.71	3.75	4.05	3.97	4.30
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	3	3	7	7	3.42	1112/1271	3.63	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	5	7	8	3.78	1049/1276	3.74	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	0	4	4	12	3.96	981/1273	3.88	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	16	14	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	****/922	3.99	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Ehrhardt,Kriste

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	4.63	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/208	4.62	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	4.63	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	4.63	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1 A 15	Required for Majors	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 6	General	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 106 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 59
Title: Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 39
Instructor: Ehrhardt,Kriste		

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

I	0	Other	2
?	6		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	9	15	10	5	3.07	1480/1528	3.98	4.18	4.31	4.16	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	9	9	12	10	3.40	1426/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	10	9	8	12	3.33	1280/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	6	6	8	8	3.47	1378/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	3	3	3	1	2.57	1419/1439	3.56	3.86	4.11	3.97	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	2	2	3	4	5	3.50	1211/1425	4.16	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	6	13	18	4.00	1050/1508	4.25	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	37	4.88	601/1526	4.54	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	4	2	13	16	3	3.32	1344/1490	4.18	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.32
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	7	13	16	3.98	1220/1428	4.54	4.43	4.49	4.43	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	4	6	28	4.48	1206/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	6	7	8	17	3.80	1207/1427	4.41	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	10	5	9	14	3.58	1282/1425	4.38	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	21	3	6	2	4	4	3.00	1194/1291	3.71	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	3	8	6	7	3.24	1158/1271	3.63	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	4	6	6	9	3.41	1180/1276	3.74	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	8	6	10	3.62	1138/1273	3.88	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	14	12	0	3	3	7	4	3.71	638/922	3.99	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.71

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	4.63	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/208	4.62	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	4.63	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	4.63	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/176	4.72	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	13	General	14	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	15	12	28	4.14	1036/1528	3.98	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	45	4.70	312/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	44	4.67	393/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	5	15	27	4.42	640/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	4	3	7	12	4.04	834/1439	3.56	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	0	2	6	5	16	4.21	726/1425	4.16	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	11	12	30	4.27	758/1508	4.25	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	23	31	4.55	1027/1526	4.54	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	17	28	4.52	328/1490	4.18	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	48	4.77	441/1428	4.54	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	3	49	4.77	886/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	46	4.75	297/1427	4.41	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	46	4.74	378/1425	4.38	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	23	1	1	8	4	18	4.16	624/1291	3.71	3.75	4.05	3.97	4.16
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	1	4	9	24	4.07	762/1271	3.63	3.49	4.16	3.98	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	1	8	10	20	3.95	960/1276	3.74	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	2	5	10	22	4.10	912/1273	3.88	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	14	21	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	350/922	3.99	3.66	4.02	3.87	4.27

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	38/198	4.63	3.15	4.16	3.90	4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	59/208	4.62	3.57	4.27	4.23	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	5	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	114/194	4.63	4.06	4.56	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	2	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	62/194	4.63	3.86	4.37	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	11	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	27/176	4.72	4.26	4.23	4.19	4.72
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	3	A	18	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	20	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	3				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106Y 02
Title:	Algebra And Elem. Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	700/1528	4.45	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	117/1527	4.91	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	328/1333	4.73	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	102/1495	4.90	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	891/1425	4.00	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	139/1508	4.82	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1027/1526	4.55	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	344/1490	4.50	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	221/1428	4.90	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	516/1436	4.90	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	364/1427	4.70	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	277/1425	4.80	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	3.75	4.05	3.97	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	0	0	2	2.25	1255/1271	2.25	3.49	4.16	3.98	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	926/1276	4.00	3.60	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.66	4.02	3.87	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106Y 02
Title:	Algebra And Elem. Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106Y 02
Title:	Algebra And Elem. Funct
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	11

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 4 Required for Majors	6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1 General	1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
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	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 115 01
Title:	Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	7	8	1	3.04	1482/1528	3.04	4.18	4.31	4.16	3.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	7	4	3.22	1462/1527	3.22	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	6	5	3.43	1260/1333	3.43	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	3	7	3	3.56	1345/1495	3.56	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	1	2	5	4	3.40	1270/1439	3.40	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	976/1425	3.91	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	6	9	3	3.41	1358/1508	3.41	4.30	4.18	4.11	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	2	6	5	0	2.81	1443/1490	2.81	3.97	4.11	4.02	2.81
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	4	6	8	3.73	1322/1428	3.73	4.43	4.49	4.43	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	1260/1436	4.41	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	5	7	3	3.19	1356/1427	3.19	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	6	3	2	7	3.30	1343/1425	3.30	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1245/1291	2.70	3.75	4.05	3.97	2.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	3	5	1	3.00	1195/1271	3.00	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	5	2	2	3	2.93	1242/1276	2.93	3.60	4.33	4.14	2.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	3	6	1	3.14	1229/1273	3.14	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	909/922	2.29	3.66	4.02	3.87	2.29



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 115 01
Title:	Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 115 01
Title:	Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 131 01
Title:	Math For Elem Tchrs I
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	238/1528	4.80	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1527	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.26	4.34	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1331/1495	3.60	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1020/1439	3.80	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	513/1425	4.40	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	586/1508	4.40	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	****	3.97	4.11	4.02	****
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.66	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.09	4.32	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.18	4.34	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1291	5.00	3.75	4.05	3.97	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.49	4.16	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1276	5.00	3.60	4.33	4.14	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1273	5.00	3.78	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.66	4.02	3.87	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 131 01
Title:	Math For Elem Tchrs I
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	5

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	141
Questionnaires:	59

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	10	18	27	4.14	1046/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	15	36	4.48	607/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	12	40	4.54	521/1333	4.24	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	6	15	20	4.26	832/1495	3.88	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	10	6	5	11	11	3.16	1338/1439	3.41	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	32	5	2	2	7	8	3.46	1236/1425	3.65	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	2	9	13	31	4.33	694/1508	4.26	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	55	5.00	1/1526	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	11	19	14	4.02	897/1490	3.87	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.02
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	17	39	4.67	637/1428	4.49	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	52	4.90	548/1436	4.62	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	5	10	16	24	4.02	1076/1427	3.98	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	5	12	35	4.28	915/1425	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	34	6	0	4	2	11	3.52	1053/1291	3.38	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.52
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	16	8	11	13	10	2.88	1222/1271	2.91	3.49	4.16	3.98	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	13	10	18	5	12	2.88	1247/1276	2.95	3.60	4.33	4.14	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	10	7	12	18	11	3.22	1218/1273	3.26	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	2	43	1	6	4	2	1	2.71	****/922	3.28	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	141
Questionnaires:	59

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	8	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	3	1	1	5	3	3.31	****/208	2.63	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	8	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	7	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	4	A	16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	23
			Required for Majors	48	Graduate
				0	Major
					1

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	141
Questionnaires:	59

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	11	General			4	Under-grad	59	Non-major		58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2									
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			0					
				?	5									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 06
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	135
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	11	16	32	4.19	983/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	6	9	41	4.38	771/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	15	38	4.48	606/1333	4.24	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	3	2	5	17	13	3.88	1175/1495	3.88	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	24	3	6	8	10	11	3.53	1203/1439	3.41	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	1	7	11	13	4.13	806/1425	3.65	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	16	38	4.41	572/1508	4.26	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	62	4.98	114/1526	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	2	3	5	23	18	4.02	904/1490	3.87	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.02
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	3	10	46	4.56	782/1428	4.49	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	2	56	4.84	742/1436	4.62	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	12	16	26	4.00	1080/1427	3.98	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	14	37	4.36	846/1425	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	25	4	4	5	5	17	3.77	923/1291	3.38	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.77
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	26	8	8	5	14	2.56	1243/1271	2.91	3.49	4.16	3.98	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	13	9	14	13	12	3.03	1227/1276	2.95	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	13	5	14	9	19	3.27	1212/1273	3.26	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	2	43	2	2	6	5	3	3.28	812/922	3.28	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.28



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 06
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	135
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	14	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	7	0	4	2	3	2.63	204/208	2.63	3.57	4.27	4.23	2.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	9	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	9	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	10	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	9	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	7	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	7	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	5	0	2	0	3	2.60	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	4	1	1	1	3	2.80	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	5	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	7	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	7	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	3	1	2	3	4	3.31	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	3	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	4	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 06
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	135
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	4	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	4	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	10	Under-grad	63	Non-major	61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 11
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	128
Questionnaires:	64

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	22	26	12	3.69	1341/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.16	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	18	22	21	3.94	1191/1527	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	16	18	20	3.70	1188/1333	4.24	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	27	2	7	9	7	11	3.50	1367/1495	3.88	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	25	3	5	9	12	10	3.54	1197/1439	3.41	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	43	3	3	4	5	6	3.38	1268/1425	3.65	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	7	15	11	31	4.03	1026/1508	4.26	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	58	3	4.02	1418/1526	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	6	22	20	9	3.56	1251/1490	3.87	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.56
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	9	23	27	4.23	1100/1428	4.49	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	10	25	25	4.13	1364/1436	4.62	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	16	18	22	3.92	1152/1427	3.98	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	13	16	26	3.90	1157/1425	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	39	4	7	5	5	3	2.83	1233/1291	3.38	3.75	4.05	3.97	2.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	8	4	17	7	14	3.30	1144/1271	2.91	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	11	6	17	7	9	2.94	1239/1276	2.95	3.60	4.33	4.14	2.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	6	6	15	10	11	3.29	1208/1273	3.26	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	16	38	4	0	2	3	1	2.70	****/922	3.28	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 11
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	128
Questionnaires:	64

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/208	2.63	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	61	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 11
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	128
Questionnaires:	64

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	25	0.00-0.99 10	A 15	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 2	B 30						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 16	General	11	Under-grad	64	Non-major	63
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	74

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	3	10	19	39	4.28	897/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	19	46	4.47	639/1527	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	12	14	44	4.42	676/1333	4.07	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	0	1	6	6	32	4.53	457/1495	3.93	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	28	0	0	8	12	25	4.38	530/1439	3.94	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	44	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	320/1425	3.91	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	15	51	4.58	371/1508	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	0	71	4.94	340/1526	4.60	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	1	2	11	20	27	4.15	800/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	6	5	61	4.68	620/1428	4.31	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	4	66	4.84	742/1436	4.47	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	12	10	47	4.34	843/1427	3.96	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	11	53	4.51	655/1425	4.09	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	31	5	4	5	4	22	3.85	869/1291	3.53	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.85
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	7	10	11	29	3.84	913/1271	3.78	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	4	6	12	12	27	3.85	1017/1276	3.48	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	3	12	11	31	4.07	924/1273	3.75	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	14	36	4	1	6	2	11	3.63	680/922	3.69	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	74

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	2	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	3	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	65	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	70	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	70	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	70	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	74

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	5	A	20	Required for Majors	60	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	74	Non-major	71
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	4				
				?	9						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	180
Questionnaires:	106

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	8	10	36	26	26	3.49	1410/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.16	3.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	11	29	31	30	3.66	1352/1527	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	10	17	34	42	4.02	997/1333	4.07	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	37	2	12	16	21	17	3.57	1341/1495	3.93	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	48	6	9	18	12	13	3.29	1302/1439	3.94	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	65	3	7	9	13	9	3.44	1246/1425	3.91	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	10	22	24	47	4.02	1042/1508	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	1	2	3	95	2	3.92	1473/1526	4.60	4.73	4.66	4.57	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	2	9	33	35	12	3.51	1269/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.51
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	9	25	35	35	3.90	1266/1428	4.31	4.43	4.49	4.43	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	4	21	37	41	4.09	1373/1436	4.47	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	26	36	30	3.76	1226/1427	3.96	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	8	32	23	36	3.77	1222/1425	4.09	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	59	7	4	16	8	8	3.14	1178/1291	3.53	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	10	3	11	17	43	3.95	823/1271	3.78	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	14	14	18	16	23	3.24	1207/1276	3.48	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	14	6	28	15	21	3.27	1211/1273	3.75	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	22	65	3	1	6	3	6	3.42	****/922	3.69	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	180
Questionnaires:	106

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	98	3	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	99	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	99	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	99	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	102	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	102	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	102	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	102	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	102	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	102	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	102	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	102	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	102	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	102	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	100	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	100	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	100	0	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	180
Questionnaires:	106

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	100	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	100	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	45	0.00-0.99	2	A	41	Required for Majors	89	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	37						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	8	Under-grad	105	Non-major	105
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	180
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	9	16	27	4.18	994/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	9	21	23	4.15	1007/1527	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	12	18	23	4.09	957/1333	4.07	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	1	6	12	16	4.14	972/1495	3.93	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	1	5	7	12	15	3.88	980/1439	3.94	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	0	5	8	14	4.10	826/1425	3.91	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	5	16	29	4.28	758/1508	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	1	15	36	4.56	1019/1526	4.60	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	2	3	7	23	11	3.83	1103/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	4	15	32	4.33	1029/1428	4.31	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	5	3	12	33	4.25	1322/1436	4.47	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	9	17	23	3.98	1096/1427	3.96	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	5	14	28	4.17	997/1425	4.09	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	3	3	10	9	15	3.75	937/1291	3.53	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	7	6	12	21	3.78	944/1271	3.78	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	4	16	11	17	3.74	1067/1276	3.48	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	16	10	21	3.96	974/1273	3.75	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	5	33	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	612/922	3.69	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.76

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	180
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	2	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 151 11	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 180
Title: Calc & Analy Geomtry I		Questionnaires: 55
Instructor: Tighe,Bonny J		

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons			Type		Majors		
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	5	A	20	Required for Majors			49	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	12	General			1	Under-grad	55	Non-major	52
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	3								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives			1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0								
				I	0	Other			0				
				?	4								

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 16
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	126
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	13	4.07	1102/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	4	10	10	3.77	1302/1527	4.01	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	5	13	3.73	1175/1333	4.07	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	5	8	5	7	3.46	1378/1495	3.93	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	12	11	4.22	689/1439	3.94	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	1	4	7	5	3.50	1211/1425	3.91	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	8	13	4.07	1003/1508	4.24	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	227/1526	4.60	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1103/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	5	17	4.34	1013/1428	4.31	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	1019/1436	4.47	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	7	6	11	3.76	1226/1427	3.96	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	6	4	14	3.90	1162/1425	4.09	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	3	10	3	7	3.40	1093/1291	3.53	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	0	1	1	7	3.54	1065/1271	3.78	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	2	1	1	5	3.08	1225/1276	3.48	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	1	2	2	6	3.69	1110/1273	3.75	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	****/922	3.69	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 16
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	126
Questionnaires:	30

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 3						
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	1				
			? 7						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151H 01
Title:	Calc/Analy Geom I-Honors
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	521/1528	4.60	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	737/1527	4.40	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	237/1333	4.80	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	746/1495	4.33	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1439	4.67	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1075/1425	3.78	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	95/1508	4.90	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	639/1490	4.29	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	572/1428	4.70	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.66	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	625/1427	4.50	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1425	4.90	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	253/1291	4.60	3.75	4.05	3.97	4.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	365/1271	4.60	3.49	4.16	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	591/1276	4.50	3.60	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1107/1273	3.70	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151H 01
Title:	Calc/Analy Geom I-Honors
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 151H 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 11
Title: Calc/Analy Geom I-Honors		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Rathinam,Muruha		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
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	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	133
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	2	7	16	24	4.08	1096/1528	4.14	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	7	20	20	4.02	1106/1527	3.91	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	3	6	18	23	4.10	957/1333	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	0	6	14	10	4.03	1033/1495	3.92	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	19	4	5	6	10	8	3.39	1273/1439	3.55	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	2	2	3	6	5	3.56	1189/1425	3.57	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	12	13	24	4.16	908/1508	4.04	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	1	48	4.92	453/1526	4.87	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	2	3	3	20	12	3.93	1019/1490	3.89	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	2	16	31	4.47	887/1428	4.35	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	8	40	4.71	996/1436	4.68	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	5	3	17	25	4.18	983/1427	3.96	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	9	13	26	4.18	989/1425	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	4	1	6	12	9	3.66	998/1291	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.66
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	6	5	31	4.38	570/1271	4.16	3.49	4.16	3.98	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	10	20	12	3.87	1012/1276	3.39	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	5	3	8	10	19	3.78	1073/1273	3.67	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	9	34	4	0	3	2	2	2.82	****/922	3.42	3.66	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	133
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	133
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	5	A	19	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	121
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	13	17	20	3.86	1256/1528	4.14	4.18	4.31	4.16	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	15	19	13	3.59	1380/1527	3.91	4.19	4.28	4.23	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	8	13	17	15	3.64	1206/1333	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	1	5	11	10	7	3.50	1367/1495	3.92	4.09	4.25	4.11	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	4	1	15	12	11	3.58	1165/1439	3.55	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	2	4	8	4	6	3.33	1285/1425	3.57	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	10	20	19	3.89	1143/1508	4.04	4.30	4.18	4.11	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	0	4	49	4.78	769/1526	4.87	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	5	16	20	6	3.42	1304/1490	3.89	3.97	4.11	4.02	3.42
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	8	16	29	4.25	1079/1428	4.35	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	6	46	4.71	980/1436	4.68	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	6	15	21	11	3.55	1290/1427	3.96	4.09	4.32	4.27	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	7	16	10	17	3.45	1318/1425	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.31	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	28	7	3	5	7	3	2.84	1232/1291	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.97	2.84
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	7	14	12	10	3.41	1112/1271	4.16	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	10	13	11	6	6	2.67	1254/1276	3.39	3.60	4.33	4.14	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	9	3	17	6	9	3.07	1237/1273	3.67	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.07
4. Were special techniques successful	11	29	5	1	6	2	2	2.69	892/922	3.42	3.66	4.02	3.87	2.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	121
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	17	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	2	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	67
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	12	14	4.48	661/1528	4.14	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	11	4.11	1034/1527	3.91	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	468/1333	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	867/1495	3.92	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1117/1439	3.55	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1032/1425	3.57	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	8	12	4.08	995/1508	4.04	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	453/1526	4.87	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	603/1490	3.89	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.32
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	0	7	17	4.33	1021/1428	4.35	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	4	21	4.63	1090/1436	4.68	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	5	15	4.15	1008/1427	3.96	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	19	4.44	755/1425	4.02	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	3	0	3	1	5	3.42	1089/1291	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	21	4.68	304/1271	4.16	3.49	4.16	3.98	4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	6	8	6	3.63	1119/1276	3.39	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	3	8	11	4.17	877/1273	3.67	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	414/922	3.42	3.66	4.02	3.87	4.15

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	67
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	67
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	18	4.50	636/1528	4.51	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	17	4.46	639/1527	4.61	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	23	4.81	237/1333	4.46	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	708/1495	4.23	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	2	2	13	4.26	647/1439	4.04	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	746/1425	4.26	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	182/1508	4.64	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	344/1490	4.49	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	686/1428	4.76	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	948/1436	4.85	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	698/1427	4.62	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	589/1425	4.76	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	376/1291	4.05	3.75	4.05	3.97	4.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	4	3	10	4.00	780/1271	3.57	3.49	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	4	2	2	11	3.90	994/1276	3.75	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	822/1273	4.00	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	2	1	0	1	8	4.00	467/922	3.52	3.66	4.02	3.87	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	170/198	2.77	3.15	4.16	3.90	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	193/208	3.54	3.57	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	184/194	3.91	4.06	4.56	4.54	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	168/194	3.67	3.86	4.37	4.30	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	126/176	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.19	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 02
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	11	20	4.42	752/1528	4.51	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	29	4.76	259/1527	4.61	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	13	23	4.64	425/1333	4.46	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	772/1495	4.23	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	2	5	7	5	3.41	1270/1439	4.04	3.86	4.11	3.97	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	431/1425	4.26	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	11	23	4.54	409/1508	4.64	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	243/1490	4.49	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	515/1428	4.76	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	310/1436	4.85	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	9	24	4.68	406/1427	4.62	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	220/1425	4.76	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	4	2	5	11	8	3.57	1038/1291	4.05	3.75	4.05	3.97	3.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	7	5	7	11	3.56	1053/1271	3.57	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	4	3	6	17	4.00	926/1276	3.75	3.60	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	5	2	6	18	4.09	912/1273	4.00	3.78	4.38	4.18	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	3	4	1	6	3	3.12	847/922	3.52	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.12

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 02
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	6	5	7	5	5	2.93	192/198	2.77	3.15	4.16	3.90	2.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	3	7	8	11	3.93	166/208	3.54	3.57	4.27	4.23	3.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	1	3	2	2	18	4.27	156/194	3.91	4.06	4.56	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	3	3	3	5	14	3.86	170/194	3.67	3.86	4.37	4.30	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	4	5	7	13	4.00	126/176	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.19	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 02
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	3				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 03
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	448/1528	4.51	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	340/1527	4.61	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	634/1333	4.46	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	1024/1495	4.23	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	520/1439	4.04	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	3	5	1	5	3.57	1180/1425	4.26	4.09	4.12	3.93	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	284/1508	4.64	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	783/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	320/1490	4.49	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	221/1428	4.76	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	258/1436	4.85	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	392/1427	4.62	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	320/1425	4.76	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	634/1291	4.05	3.75	4.05	3.97	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	1	3	4	6	3.39	1121/1271	3.57	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1102/1276	3.75	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	2	2	9	3.82	1050/1273	4.00	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	707/922	3.52	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.55

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 03
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	5	3	2	0	1	2.00	195/198	2.77	3.15	4.16	3.90	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	2	3	2	4	0	2.73	203/208	3.54	3.57	4.27	4.23	2.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	189/194	3.91	4.06	4.56	4.54	3.30
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	5	1	1	3	1	2.45	193/194	3.67	3.86	4.37	4.30	2.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	3	0	0	7	3.82	144/176	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.19	3.82
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 7	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
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	0				

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 03
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	23

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

?      2

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 10
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	687/1528	4.51	4.18	4.31	4.16	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	538/1527	4.61	4.19	4.28	4.23	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1070/1333	4.46	4.26	4.34	4.26	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	903/1495	4.23	4.09	4.25	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	788/1439	4.04	3.86	4.11	3.97	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1425	4.26	4.09	4.12	3.93	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	371/1508	4.64	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	509/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	651/1490	4.49	3.97	4.11	4.02	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	478/1428	4.76	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	917/1436	4.85	4.66	4.74	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	420/1427	4.62	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	242/1425	4.76	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	4.05	3.75	4.05	3.97	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	2	4	3	3.33	1135/1271	3.57	3.49	4.16	3.98	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1180/1276	3.75	3.60	4.33	4.14	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	0	6	3.82	1054/1273	4.00	3.78	4.38	4.18	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	779/922	3.52	3.66	4.02	3.87	3.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 10
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	194/198	2.77	3.15	4.16	3.90	2.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	157/208	3.54	3.57	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	147/194	3.91	4.06	4.56	4.54	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	93/194	3.67	3.86	4.37	4.30	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	24/176	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.19	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 01
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	75
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	27	18	4.20	983/1528	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	17	28	4.44	672/1527	4.44	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	35	4.51	564/1333	4.51	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	0	4	12	15	4.15	952/1495	4.15	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	1	4	12	16	4.21	710/1439	4.21	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	1	2	6	17	4.25	669/1425	4.25	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	15	28	4.34	667/1508	4.34	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	43	4.86	636/1526	4.86	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	2	1	5	18	16	4.07	864/1490	4.07	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.07
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	1	8	38	4.58	758/1428	4.58	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	5	10	33	4.46	1213/1436	4.46	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	7	37	4.56	553/1427	4.56	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	7	37	4.58	578/1425	4.58	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	2	6	9	23	4.17	614/1291	4.17	3.75	4.05	4.14	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	4	3	2	3	10	3.55	1061/1271	3.55	3.49	4.16	4.21	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	4	1	4	6	7	3.50	1152/1276	3.50	3.60	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	4	2	4	6	6	3.36	1195/1273	3.36	3.78	4.38	4.43	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	29	11	2	3	1	2	3	3.09	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 01
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	75
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	3	1	1	1	5	3.36	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	6	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.18	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	6	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	6	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	6	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	6	0	1	2	2	2.45	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	4	0	1	2	3	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	5	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	2	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	4	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 01
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	75
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	41 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1 B 18		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	6 C 10	General	0 Under-grad 51 Non-major 51
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 11		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	10	6	3.69	1337/1528	3.62	4.18	4.31	4.34	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	8	7	6	3.46	1414/1527	3.50	4.19	4.28	4.32	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	10	5	3.42	1263/1333	3.50	4.26	4.34	4.40	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	6	3	6	1	2.89	1472/1495	3.50	4.09	4.25	4.28	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	5	5	4	3.32	1297/1439	3.76	3.86	4.11	4.12	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	4	7	5	1	2.95	1358/1425	3.58	4.09	4.12	4.11	2.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	8	5	6	3.27	1388/1508	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.19	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	24	4.85	671/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	3	7	8	1	3.05	1402/1490	3.20	3.97	4.11	4.11	3.05
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	11	6	3.88	1273/1428	3.93	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	1066/1436	4.56	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	9	7	2	3.04	1375/1427	3.18	4.09	4.32	4.33	3.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	6	4	7	6	3.36	1333/1425	3.29	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/1291	2.91	3.75	4.05	4.14	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1242/1271	3.24	3.49	4.16	4.21	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1135/1276	3.59	3.60	4.33	4.37	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1209/1273	3.59	3.78	4.38	4.43	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.18	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 02
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	9	9	3.81	1280/1528	3.62	4.18	4.31	4.34	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	10	4	3.52	1401/1527	3.50	4.19	4.28	4.32	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	4	8	6	3	3.00	1306/1333	3.50	4.26	4.34	4.40	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	3	2	2	7	3.56	1345/1495	3.50	4.09	4.25	4.28	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	968/1439	3.76	3.86	4.11	4.12	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	7	3	4	3.60	1167/1425	3.58	4.09	4.12	4.11	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	8	11	4.04	1026/1508	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	601/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	2	0	8	7	2	3.37	1327/1490	3.20	3.97	4.11	4.11	3.37
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	8	6	8	3.79	1301/1428	3.93	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	1252/1436	4.56	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	5	9	5	3.61	1280/1427	3.18	4.09	4.32	4.33	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	8	6	3.57	1285/1425	3.29	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1180/1291	2.91	3.75	4.05	4.14	3.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1271	3.24	3.49	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1276	3.59	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1273	3.59	3.78	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 02
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Kogan, Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	26

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 03
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	7	5	9	8	3.62	1368/1528	3.62	4.18	4.31	4.34	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	11	9	3.93	1191/1527	3.50	4.19	4.28	4.32	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	14	4.14	925/1333	3.50	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	1103/1495	3.50	4.09	4.25	4.28	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	1	8	13	4.29	615/1439	3.76	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	2	1	3	12	4.21	714/1425	3.58	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	6	19	4.46	503/1508	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	227/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	9	11	3	3.67	1203/1490	3.20	3.97	4.11	4.11	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	6	16	4.31	1037/1428	3.93	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	23	4.69	1019/1436	4.56	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	3	9	10	3.69	1252/1427	3.18	4.09	4.32	4.33	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	5	9	10	3.69	1249/1425	3.29	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	4	2	1	2	1	2.40	1264/1291	2.91	3.75	4.05	4.14	2.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	867/1271	3.24	3.49	4.16	4.21	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1128/1276	3.59	3.60	4.33	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1016/1273	3.59	3.78	4.38	4.43	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 03
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	29

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 8	C 8 General 0	Under-grad 29	Non-major 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other 1		
			? 2		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	8	7	5	3.35	1445/1528	3.62	4.18	4.31	4.34	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	6	4	3.08	1475/1527	3.50	4.19	4.28	4.32	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	8	7	6	3.42	1263/1333	3.50	4.26	4.34	4.40	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	0	5	3	5	3.60	1331/1495	3.50	4.09	4.25	4.28	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	4	9	5	3.52	1203/1439	3.76	3.86	4.11	4.12	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	3	5	4	4	3.56	1184/1425	3.58	4.09	4.12	4.11	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	14	4.23	808/1508	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1526	4.92	4.73	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	3	11	3	1	2.73	1453/1490	3.20	3.97	4.11	4.11	2.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	9	6	7	3.75	1313/1428	3.93	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	2	19	4.48	1198/1436	4.56	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	10	5	1	3	2.40	1406/1427	3.18	4.09	4.32	4.33	2.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	7	3	4	3	2.54	1402/1425	3.29	4.18	4.34	4.37	2.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	2	8	2	5	3.20	1160/1291	2.91	3.75	4.05	4.14	3.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	4	1	0	0	1	1.83	****/1271	3.24	3.49	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	5	0	0	1	0	1.50	****/1276	3.59	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/1273	3.59	3.78	4.38	4.43	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 04	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 48
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Guler,Osman		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221H 01
Title:	Intro Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Suri,Manil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	405/1528	4.69	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	771/1527	4.38	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	620/1333	4.47	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	891/1495	4.21	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	802/1439	4.09	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	358/1425	4.55	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	144/1508	4.80	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	198/1490	4.69	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	286/1428	4.87	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.66	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	625/1427	4.50	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	502/1425	4.64	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	849/1291	3.89	3.75	4.05	4.14	3.89
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.21	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8
				Required for Majors	15
				Graduate	0
				Major	5

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221H 01
Title:	Intro Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Suri,Manil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General			0	Under-grad	16	Non-major			11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives			1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0										
				I	0	Other			0						
				?	0										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Lynn,Yen-mow

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1333/1528	4.25	4.18	4.31	4.34	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	1496/1527	3.94	4.19	4.28	4.32	2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1087/1333	4.37	4.26	4.34	4.40	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1437/1495	4.08	4.09	4.25	4.28	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	851/1439	4.02	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	891/1425	4.25	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1050/1508	4.28	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	978/1526	4.85	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	2	3	3	0	1	2.44	1466/1490	3.43	3.97	4.11	4.11	2.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1202/1428	4.32	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	1304/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	1	1	1	2.30	1412/1427	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.33	2.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	2	1	2.60	1400/1425	3.57	4.18	4.34	4.37	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1194/1291	3.53	3.75	4.05	4.14	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.43	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 225 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 27
Title: Intro Differentl Equatns		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Lynn,Yen-mow		

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

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	908/1528	4.25	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	10	4.08	1064/1527	3.94	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	1	17	4.32	778/1333	4.37	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	992/1495	4.08	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	6	6	6	3.59	1159/1439	4.02	3.86	4.11	4.12	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	603/1425	4.25	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	8	12	4.15	908/1508	4.28	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	227/1526	4.85	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	11	7	1	3.40	1313/1490	3.43	3.97	4.11	4.11	3.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	1093/1428	4.32	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	1162/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	10	5	5	3.36	1335/1427	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.33	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	10	7	3.73	1232/1425	3.57	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1046/1291	3.53	3.75	4.05	4.14	3.55
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	26

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	18
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Under-grad	26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	2
			? 6		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	36	4.79	251/1528	4.25	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	35	4.83	179/1527	3.94	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	165/1333	4.37	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	102/1495	4.08	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	1	2	5	21	4.47	419/1439	4.02	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	454/1425	4.25	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	34	4.70	250/1508	4.28	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	170/1526	4.85	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	15	18	4.46	419/1490	3.43	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.46
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	8	33	4.74	515/1428	4.32	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	516/1436	4.58	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	7	29	4.59	529/1427	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	7	28	4.38	830/1425	3.57	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	2	1	3	6	12	4.04	706/1291	3.53	3.75	4.05	4.14	4.04
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	35	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	4.18	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	34
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Kang,Weining

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	32	4.79	265/1528	4.25	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	27	4.70	312/1527	4.10	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	33	4.87	183/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	785/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	2	8	14	4.40	499/1439	3.97	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	292/1425	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	8	27	4.65	306/1508	4.09	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	13	4.34	1208/1526	4.22	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	16	14	4.26	675/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.26
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	133/1428	4.35	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	34	4.92	464/1436	4.52	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	9	25	4.54	577/1427	3.97	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	31	4.78	306/1425	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	28	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	****/1291	3.99	3.75	4.05	4.14	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	****/1271	2.11	3.49	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/1276	2.89	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	****/1273	2.94	3.78	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	30	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	52
Title:	Multivariable Calculus			Questionnaires:	38
Instructor:	Kang, Weining				

  

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	9	21	4.33	835/1528	4.25	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	12	17	4.17	988/1527	4.10	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	6	5	20	4.38	731/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	785/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	829/1439	3.97	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	776/1425	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	7	2	8	14	3.60	1293/1508	4.09	4.30	4.18	4.19	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	12	21	2	3.64	1507/1526	4.22	4.73	4.66	4.64	3.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	4	11	14	4.16	778/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.16
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	12	22	4.54	806/1428	4.35	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	310/1436	4.52	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	4	12	17	4.20	959/1427	3.97	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	7	22	4.31	886/1425	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	480/1291	3.99	3.75	4.05	4.14	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1163/1271	2.11	3.49	4.16	4.21	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	654/1276	2.89	3.60	4.33	4.37	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	845/1273	2.94	3.78	4.38	4.43	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	27	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 17	Required for Majors	30 Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 10		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2 C 3	General	1 Under-grad 36 Non-major 29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	36

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

?      3

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Lynn,Yen-mow

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1472/1528	4.25	4.18	4.31	4.34	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1484/1527	4.10	4.19	4.28	4.32	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1285/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.40	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1301/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.28	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1270/1439	3.97	3.86	4.11	4.12	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1139/1425	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.11	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	921/1508	4.09	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1368/1526	4.22	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	0	3	0	1	2.43	1469/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.11	2.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1401/1428	4.35	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1426/1436	4.52	4.66	4.74	4.76	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	0	1	2	2.71	1399/1427	3.97	4.09	4.32	4.33	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1372/1425	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1061/1291	3.99	3.75	4.05	4.14	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1270/1271	2.11	3.49	4.16	4.21	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1275/1276	2.89	3.60	4.33	4.37	1.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1273/1273	2.94	3.78	4.38	4.43	1.67

### Frequency Distribution



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 251 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 47
Title: Multivariable Calculus		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Lynn, Yen-mow		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Zweck, John W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	38	4.73	348/1528	4.25	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	31	4.52	550/1527	4.10	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	32	4.58	479/1333	4.28	4.26	4.34	4.40	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	4	16	12	4.09	1011/1495	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	3	5	16	12	4.03	840/1439	3.97	3.86	4.11	4.12	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	3	1	2	10	15	4.06	852/1425	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	4	8	17	17	3.96	1093/1508	4.09	4.30	4.18	4.19	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	36	4.75	811/1526	4.22	4.73	4.66	4.64	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	18	20	4.46	404/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.46
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	42	4.89	237/1428	4.35	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	45	4.92	464/1436	4.52	4.66	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	13	28	4.42	757/1427	3.97	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	36	4.60	556/1425	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	27	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	634/1291	3.99	3.75	4.05	4.14	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/1271	2.11	3.49	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	****/1276	2.89	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	****/1273	2.94	3.78	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	36	8	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Zweck, John W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	42
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 01
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	1	4	1	2.73	1510/1528	4.09	4.18	4.31	4.34	2.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	2	2	3	3.00	1484/1527	4.16	4.19	4.28	4.27	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	0	0	3	3	2.91	1319/1333	4.18	4.26	4.34	4.34	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1486/1495	3.93	4.09	4.25	4.28	2.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	0	1	0	1	1.86	1434/1439	3.21	3.86	4.11	4.13	1.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	1399/1425	4.03	4.09	4.12	4.17	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	3	1	3.09	1413/1508	4.10	4.30	4.18	4.17	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1395/1526	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.68	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	4	2	0	2.75	1450/1490	3.96	3.97	4.11	4.11	2.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1394/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1382/1436	4.63	4.66	4.74	4.74	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	2	2	0	2.20	1417/1427	3.78	4.09	4.32	4.31	2.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	2	1	0	2.10	1417/1425	3.77	4.18	4.34	4.34	2.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1291	****	3.75	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.40	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 301 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 17
Title: Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	2				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	376/1528	4.09	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	575/1527	4.16	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	237/1333	4.18	4.26	4.34	4.34	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1495	3.93	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	991/1439	3.21	3.86	4.11	4.13	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	207/1425	4.03	4.09	4.12	4.17	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	530/1508	4.10	4.30	4.18	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	710/1490	3.96	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.22
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	572/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	516/1436	4.63	4.66	4.74	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	959/1427	3.78	4.09	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	966/1425	3.77	4.18	4.34	4.34	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.40	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    1	0.00-0.99    0	A            2	Required for Majors    9	Graduate            1	Major                4

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4									
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General		0	Under-grad	9	Non-major			6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 03
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	214/1528	4.09	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	47/1527	4.16	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	210/1333	4.18	4.26	4.34	4.34	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	109/1495	3.93	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	2	4	4	12	3.92	951/1439	3.21	3.86	4.11	4.13	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	106/1425	4.03	4.09	4.12	4.17	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	26	4.77	172/1508	4.10	4.30	4.18	4.17	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	227/1526	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	65/1490	3.96	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1436	4.63	4.66	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	96/1427	3.78	4.09	4.32	4.31	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1425	3.77	4.18	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	23	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1291	****	3.75	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.40	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.31	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 03
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	3.86	4.37	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 302 01
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	307/1528	4.75	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	368/1527	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	500/1333	4.57	4.26	4.34	4.34	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	350/1495	4.63	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	788/1439	4.11	3.86	4.11	4.13	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	377/1425	4.53	4.09	4.12	4.17	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	85/1508	4.91	4.30	4.18	4.17	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	566/1526	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	328/1490	4.53	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	645/1436	4.86	4.66	4.74	4.74	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	230/1427	4.81	4.09	4.32	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	82/1425	4.95	4.18	4.34	4.34	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	614/1291	4.17	3.75	4.05	4.09	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 302 01
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	24

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 8 Required for Majors	Graduate 3	Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General	Under-grad 21	Non-major 6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 4	F 0 Electives	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other		
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 381 01
Title:	Lin. Meth/Oper Research
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1140/1528	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1279/1527	3.80	4.19	4.28	4.27	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1145/1333	3.80	4.26	4.34	4.34	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	903/1495	4.20	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1153/1439	3.60	3.86	4.11	4.13	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1088/1425	3.75	4.09	4.12	4.17	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	586/1508	4.40	4.30	4.18	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1285/1526	4.25	4.73	4.66	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1269/1490	3.50	3.97	4.11	4.11	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1298/1428	3.80	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1406/1436	3.80	4.66	4.74	4.74	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1379/1427	3.00	4.09	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1357/1425	3.20	4.18	4.34	4.34	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	3.75	4.05	4.09	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.40	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 381 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 6
Title: Lin. Meth/Oper Research		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Guler,Osman		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	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 Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 385 01
Title:	Intro To Math Modeling
Instructor:	Kang,Weining

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1214/1528	3.93	4.18	4.31	4.34	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	942/1527	4.21	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	489/1333	4.57	4.26	4.34	4.34	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	808/1495	4.29	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1361/1439	3.00	3.86	4.11	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	301/1425	4.60	4.09	4.12	4.17	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	654/1508	4.36	4.30	4.18	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1142/1526	4.43	4.73	4.66	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1096/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.11	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	942/1428	4.43	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	1311/1436	4.29	4.66	4.74	4.74	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	950/1427	4.21	4.09	4.32	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	1140/1425	3.93	4.18	4.34	4.34	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	480/1291	4.33	3.75	4.05	4.09	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.40	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 385 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 26
Title: Intro To Math Modeling		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Kang,Weining		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1223/1528	3.85	4.18	4.31	4.39	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1057/1527	3.82	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	957/1333	4.02	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1421/1495	3.50	4.09	4.25	4.33	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	0	3	3	3.67	1126/1439	3.76	3.86	4.11	4.20	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	489/1425	4.16	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1246/1508	3.78	4.30	4.18	4.24	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	724/1526	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1046/1490	3.73	3.97	4.11	4.19	3.91
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	953/1428	4.34	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1078/1436	4.73	4.66	4.74	4.75	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	812/1427	3.86	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1148/1425	3.73	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1061/1291	3.25	3.75	4.05	4.10	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	780/1271	3.36	3.49	4.16	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1102/1276	3.48	3.60	4.33	4.49	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	776/1273	3.95	3.78	4.38	4.55	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.66	4.02	4.23	4.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	12

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 02
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	5	6	9	3.78	1290/1528	3.85	4.18	4.31	4.39	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	7	6	3.57	1387/1527	3.82	4.19	4.28	4.30	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	6	10	3.96	1045/1333	4.02	4.26	4.34	4.37	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1281/1495	3.50	4.09	4.25	4.33	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	1	1	2	7	3.85	997/1439	3.76	3.86	4.11	4.20	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	4	2	9	3.89	992/1425	4.16	4.09	4.12	4.26	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	3	6	10	3.83	1192/1508	3.78	4.30	4.18	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	3	8	5	3.55	1254/1490	3.73	3.97	4.11	4.19	3.55
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	1072/1428	4.34	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	774/1436	4.73	4.66	4.74	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	1	5	5	7	3.35	1338/1427	3.86	4.09	4.32	4.37	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	3	5	8	3.55	1292/1425	3.73	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	1194/1291	3.25	3.75	4.05	4.10	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1234/1271	3.36	3.49	4.16	4.33	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1200/1276	3.48	3.60	4.33	4.49	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1152/1273	3.95	3.78	4.38	4.55	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/922	4.00	3.66	4.02	4.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 02
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	3	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2 D 1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 407 01
Title:	Modern Algebra & No.Theo
Instructor:	Toll,Charles

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	334/1528	4.73	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	368/1527	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	620/1333	4.47	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	520/1439	4.38	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	771/1508	4.27	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	919/1526	4.67	4.73	4.66	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	722/1490	4.21	3.97	4.11	4.19	4.21
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	459/1428	4.77	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	901/1436	4.77	4.66	4.74	4.75	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	874/1427	4.31	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	830/1425	4.38	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1291	****	3.75	4.05	4.10	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 407 01
Title:	Modern Algebra & No.Theo
Instructor:	Toll,Charles

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3 Required for Majors	9	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 5 General	0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	2	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 410 01
Title:	Intro Complex Analysis
Instructor:	Zweck,John W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.18	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	656/1527	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	393/1333	4.67	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	350/1495	4.63	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	446/1439	4.44	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	566/1526	4.91	4.73	4.66	4.71	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	177/1490	4.73	3.97	4.11	4.19	4.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	199/1428	4.92	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.92	4.66	4.74	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1427	4.92	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	242/1425	4.83	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1291	****	3.75	4.05	4.10	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 410 01
Title:	Intro Complex Analysis
Instructor:	Zweck,John W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	12

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives			6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			2					
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	6	21	4.53	601/1528	4.53	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	368/1527	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	316/1333	4.73	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	682/1495	4.39	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	314/1439	4.57	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	533/1425	4.39	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	66/1508	4.93	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	755/1526	4.79	4.73	4.66	4.71	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	518/1490	4.38	3.97	4.11	4.19	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	335/1428	4.83	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	1043/1436	4.67	4.66	4.74	4.75	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	420/1427	4.67	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	25	4.63	515/1425	4.63	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	21	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	849/1291	3.89	3.75	4.05	4.10	3.89
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.23	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	30

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    2	0.00-0.99    2	A    13	Required for Majors    16	Graduate    5	Major    27
28-55    0	1.00-1.99    0	B    15			
56-83    1	2.00-2.99    1	C    1	General    0	Under-grad    25	Non-major    3
84-150    11	3.00-3.49    7	D    0			
Grad.    5	3.50-4.00    7	F    0	Electives    7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P    0			
		I    0	Other    1		
		?    0			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 441 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	23
Title:	Intro Numerical Analysis		Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	815/1528	4.35	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	720/1527	4.41	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	351/1333	4.71	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	708/1495	4.36	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	5	3	3.54	1197/1439	3.54	3.86	4.11	4.20	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	826/1425	4.10	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	586/1508	4.40	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	675/1490	4.25	3.97	4.11	4.19	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	735/1428	4.60	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.66	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1136/1427	3.93	4.09	4.32	4.37	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	726/1425	4.47	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	366/1291	4.46	3.75	4.05	4.10	4.46
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 441 01
Title:	Intro Numerical Analysis
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	3.57	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.06	4.56	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/176	****	4.26	4.23	3.87	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.63	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 475 01
Title:	Combinatorics/Graph Thry
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	815/1528	4.35	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	1078/1527	4.05	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	5	9	3.95	1045/1333	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.37	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1233/1495	3.78	4.09	4.25	4.33	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	0	4	9	4.19	727/1439	4.19	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	845/1425	4.08	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	4	11	4.15	908/1508	4.15	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	1110/1490	3.81	3.97	4.11	4.19	3.81
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	6	10	4.10	1176/1428	4.10	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1221/1436	4.45	4.66	4.74	4.75	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	3	6	6	3.50	1300/1427	3.50	4.09	4.32	4.37	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	5	6	3.40	1327/1425	3.40	4.18	4.34	4.37	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1291	****	3.75	4.05	4.10	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	0	1	2	2.71	1234/1271	2.71	3.49	4.16	4.33	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1230/1276	3.00	3.60	4.33	4.49	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1232/1273	3.13	3.78	4.38	4.55	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 475 01
Title:	Combinatorics/Graph Thry
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	20

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	6	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 479 01
Title:	Math Problem Solving Sem
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	713/1528	4.44	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	818/1527	4.33	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1333	****	4.26	4.34	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1439	4.67	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	583/1425	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1096/1490	3.83	3.97	4.11	4.19	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	385/1428	4.80	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.66	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1427	4.80	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.18	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1291	****	3.75	4.05	4.10	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.55	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 479 01
Title:	Math Problem Solving Sem
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 481 01
Title:	Math Modeling
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	521/1528	4.60	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1527	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.09	4.25	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	573/1439	4.33	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.09	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	144/1508	4.80	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	494/1490	4.40	3.97	4.11	4.19	4.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	385/1428	4.80	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.66	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1427	4.80	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.18	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1291	5.00	3.75	4.05	4.10	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1156/1271	3.25	3.49	4.16	4.33	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	926/1276	4.00	3.60	4.33	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1273	4.67	3.78	4.38	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 481 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 8
Title: Math Modeling		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Rostamian,Roube		

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

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 482 01
Title:	Nonlinear Optimization
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1528	4.83	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1527	4.83	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	210/1333	4.83	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	177/1495	4.80	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1439	5.00	3.86	4.11	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	129/1508	4.83	4.30	4.18	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.97	4.11	4.19	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.66	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.09	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.18	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1291	5.00	3.75	4.05	4.10	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 482 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	8
Title:	Nonlinear Optimization		Questionnaires:	6
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa			

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0									
				I	0	Other	0							
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 485 01
Title:	Intro Calc Of Variations
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	348/1528	4.73	4.18	4.31	4.39	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	410/1527	4.64	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	147/1333	4.91	4.26	4.34	4.37	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	341/1495	4.64	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1439	4.22	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.30	4.18	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	419/1490	4.45	3.97	4.11	4.19	4.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	806/1428	4.55	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	516/1436	4.91	4.66	4.74	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	463/1427	4.64	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	515/1425	4.64	4.18	4.34	4.37	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	539/1291	4.25	3.75	4.05	4.10	4.25

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	5	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 485 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title: Intro Calc Of Variations		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Hoffman,Kathlee		

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

Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							
				P	0										
				I	0	Other	2								
				?	0										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 601 01
Title:	Measure Theory
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1528	4.83	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	898/1333	4.17	4.26	4.34	4.39	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.24	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.09	4.12	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	129/1508	4.83	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	579/1490	4.33	3.97	4.11	4.16	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1138/1428	4.17	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	742/1436	4.83	4.66	4.74	4.83	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	475/1425	4.67	4.18	4.34	4.34	4.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	780/1271	4.00	3.49	4.16	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	926/1276	4.00	3.60	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.78	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 601 01
Title:	Measure Theory
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

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

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 620 01
Title:	Numerical Analysis I
Instructor:	Minkoff,Susan E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	739/1528	4.43	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	795/1527	4.36	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	564/1333	4.50	4.26	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.24	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.09	4.12	4.28	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	163/1508	4.79	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1002/1526	4.57	4.73	4.66	4.81	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	911/1490	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.16	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	553/1428	4.71	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	413/1436	4.93	4.66	4.74	4.83	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	625/1427	4.50	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	854/1425	4.36	4.18	4.34	4.34	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1143/1291	3.25	3.75	4.05	3.99	3.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	934/1271	3.80	3.49	4.16	4.27	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	837/1276	4.20	3.60	4.33	4.43	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1059/1273	3.80	3.78	4.38	4.52	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/922	****	3.66	4.02	4.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 620 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Numerical Analysis I		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Minkoff, Susan E		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.15	4.16	4.54	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2 A 8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	9	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 621 01
Title:	Numer. Methods For PDE
Instructor:	Gobbert,Matthia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	835/1528	4.33	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1527	4.83	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.26	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1495	4.83	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	367/1439	4.50	3.86	4.11	4.24	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.09	4.12	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	129/1508	4.83	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	689/1526	4.83	4.73	4.66	4.81	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	344/1490	4.50	3.97	4.11	4.16	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1138/1428	4.17	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1183/1436	4.50	4.66	4.74	4.83	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1076/1425	4.00	4.18	4.34	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	614/1291	4.17	3.75	4.05	3.99	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	644/1271	4.25	3.49	4.16	4.27	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	591/1276	4.50	3.60	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	408/1273	4.75	3.78	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	158/922	4.67	3.66	4.02	4.00	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 621 01
Title:	Numer. Methods For PDE
Instructor:	Gobbert,Matthia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****

### 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	4	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
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	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 635 01
Title:	Finite Elements
Instructor:	Suri,Manil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1242/1528	3.89	4.18	4.31	4.45	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	932/1527	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1215/1333	3.60	4.26	4.34	4.39	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	992/1495	4.11	4.09	4.25	4.33	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1216/1439	3.50	3.86	4.11	4.24	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1139/1425	3.67	4.09	4.12	4.28	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	820/1508	4.22	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.73	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	675/1490	4.25	3.97	4.11	4.16	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	794/1428	4.56	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	886/1436	4.78	4.66	4.74	4.83	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	713/1427	4.44	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	870/1425	4.33	4.18	4.34	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1291	****	3.75	4.05	3.99	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1271	****	3.49	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1276	****	3.60	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1273	****	3.78	4.38	4.52	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 635 01
Title:	Finite Elements
Instructor:	Suri,Manil

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

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

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