

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1229/1520	3.52	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	1200/1520	3.62	4.27	4.27	4.20	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	713/1291	4.30	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1010/1483	3.81	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	2	7	3	3.29	1269/1417	3.29	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	3	4	4	3.31	1274/1405	3.66	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	8	4	3.61	1287/1504	3.50	4.36	4.16	4.13	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	829/1519	4.81	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	2	1	4	4	3.29	1365/1495	3.19	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1292/1459	3.68	4.48	4.47	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1195/1460	4.44	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	2	4	7	3.61	1289/1455	3.31	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	3	9	3.94	1140/1456	3.56	4.28	4.34	4.26	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1157/1316	3.13	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	1	5	4	3.33	1115/1243	3.25	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	1083/1241	3.93	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	0	5	7	4.00	947/1236	4.08	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	861/889	2.80	3.38	4.02	3.89	2.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 12	Under-grad 18 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
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	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	2	2	3.14	1491/1520	3.52	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	3	2	3.36	1416/1520	3.62	4.27	4.27	4.20	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	844/1291	4.30	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1272/1483	3.81	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1273/1417	3.29	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	843/1405	3.66	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	5	2	3.38	1362/1504	3.50	4.36	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1519	4.81	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	3	1	3.09	1408/1495	3.19	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	4	3	3	3.46	1393/1459	3.68	4.48	4.47	4.40	3.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1278/1460	4.44	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	2	2	3	3.00	1400/1455	3.31	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	4	2	3	3.17	1386/1456	3.56	4.28	4.34	4.26	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1210/1316	3.13	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1166/1243	3.25	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	837/1241	3.93	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	878/1236	4.08	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	12 Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	5	29	4.50	607/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	33	4.78	226/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	34	4.78	267/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	3	27	4.73	253/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	395/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	235/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	32	4.74	199/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	473/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	11	23	4.57	288/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	119/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	570/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	173/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	120/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	20	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	256/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	516/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	324/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	687/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	20	12	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/889	3.75	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	40

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	33	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/158	4.60	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	40

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. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1 A 18	Required for Majors	18
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 4	General	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 F 0	Electives	0
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			6 ? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



)

)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	45

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	10	31	4.53	568/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	40	4.89	130/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	125/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	201/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	1	8	15	4.44	428/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	0	1	2	0	18	4.67	235/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	10	32	4.72	216/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	41	4.95	296/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	102/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	39	4.89	234/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	39	4.91	544/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	33	4.74	347/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	38	4.86	246/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	23	1	2	2	1	12	4.17	619/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	1	2	1	14	4.05	756/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	5	2	14	4.27	755/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	1	0	6	14	4.41	725/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	23	11	3	1	2	1	4	3.18	****/889	3.75	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	45

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	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	4.60	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	6	A	24	Required for Majors		23	Graduate	0	Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General		16	Under-grad	45	Non-major
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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			
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	11	14	4.23	954/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	6	20	4.43	681/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	9	17	4.23	837/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	4	6	11	4.00	1010/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	803/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1034/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	4	3	4	19	4.27	737/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1022/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	498/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	218/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	3	20	4.34	830/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	5	21	4.52	672/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	3	3	1	8	3.93	799/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	****/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2 A 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	(
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 8	General	13	Under-grad	30	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 1						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Sparr,Leroy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	3	7	5	3.48	1418/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	9	4.00	1086/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	756/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	6	3	7	3.94	1078/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	1132/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1156/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	3	9	3.95	1050/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	296/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	4	8	3	3.59	1255/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	4	4	10	3.90	1284/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	3	1	15	4.33	1303/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	4	4	9	3.76	1236/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	1021/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1210/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	824/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	922/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	702/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/889	3.75	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Sparr,Leroy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	21

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	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	4.60	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Sparr,Leroy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	53
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														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 14	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	(
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 1	General	10	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
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				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

1

1

1

0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	1	6	7	3.82	1265/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	1	12	4.24	912/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	1	12	4.24	830/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	0	1	2	9	3.93	1089/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1348/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1034/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	2	10	4.06	957/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1001/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	891/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	808/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	1	1	13	4.35	1293/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	1	1	13	4.35	819/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	620/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1308/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1151/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	1	2	3	3.22	1183/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	1173/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/889	3.75	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	17

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	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	44/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	16/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	30/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	66/158	4.60	4.35	4.36	4.43	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	17

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. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3 A 8	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 5	General	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1 D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 06
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	778/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	92/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	278/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	636/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	362/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	197/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	694/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	568/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	445/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	884/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	130/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	269/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	169/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	405/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	655/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	505/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/889	3.75	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 06
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	42
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	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	4.60	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 2	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 13
84-150	0	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	
			? 7		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 07
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	802/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	283/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	325/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	428/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	169/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	503/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	520/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	374/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	864/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	307/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	866/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	958/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1056/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1074/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	456/889	3.75	3.38	4.02	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 07
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	11

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/158	4.60	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 07
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	47
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														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 1	General	4 Under-grad 11 Non-major 1
84-150	2	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
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			3 ? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 08
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1376/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	584/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	546/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	578/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	641/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	575/1405	4.29	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	362/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	817/1519	4.89	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	638/1495	4.24	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	568/1459	4.66	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1366/1460	4.64	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	512/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	465/1456	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	256/1316	3.97	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	865/1243	3.96	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1003/1241	4.04	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	829/1236	4.18	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	709/889	3.75	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 08
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	14

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/164	4.75	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	4.75	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/160	4.83	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	4.60	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 08
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	14

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 3	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 5	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	0	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 0	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

4

4

3

3

4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 115 01
Title:	Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	6	4	13	9	3.70	1330/1520	3.70	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	11	15	4.21	930/1520	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	9	16	4.24	823/1291	4.24	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	0	11	11	4.39	647/1483	4.39	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	880/1417	3.95	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	9	16	4.19	825/1504	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	4	5	12	5	3.59	1251/1495	3.59	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	940/1459	4.42	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	884/1460	4.77	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	2	6	8	8	3.80	1220/1455	3.80	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	4	5	6	11	3.92	1155/1456	3.92	4.28	4.34	4.26	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	16	1	1	5	0	2	3.11	1199/1316	3.11	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	1	8	5	3.82	892/1243	3.82	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	3	4	5	4	3.47	1141/1241	3.47	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1099/1236	3.65	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	17	10	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 115 01
Title:	Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 9	General	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 2		Under-grad 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	56/1520	4.97	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	226/1520	4.77	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	278/1291	4.77	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	427/1483	4.57	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	726/1417	4.13	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	525/1405	4.38	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	54/1504	4.93	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	672/1519	4.86	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	202/1495	4.68	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	80/1459	4.96	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	218/1460	4.96	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	294/1455	4.79	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	211/1456	4.89	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	680/1316	4.08	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 13	Required for Majors	22
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 7	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 7		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	145
Questionnaires:	44

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	13	24	4.32	862/1520	4.04	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	9	26	4.32	834/1520	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	13	25	4.36	730/1291	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	2	5	13	12	3.91	1112/1483	3.88	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	5	10	5	13	3.56	1163/1417	3.62	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	3	6	7	10	3.81	1034/1405	3.74	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	8	11	24	4.37	606/1504	4.21	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	40	4.88	632/1519	4.88	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	4	16	13	4.18	749/1495	3.97	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	7	32	4.62	696/1459	4.42	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	596/1460	4.79	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	10	26	4.44	723/1455	4.21	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	5	32	4.52	662/1456	4.32	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	4	0	6	5	10	3.68	976/1316	3.50	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	5	7	10	10	3.41	1092/1243	3.18	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	11	6	17	3.95	962/1241	3.43	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	1	11	6	13	3.51	1138/1236	3.47	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	7	16	6	3	4	3	5	2.90	847/889	2.94	3.38	4.02	3.89	2.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	145
Questionnaires:	44

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	38	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	145
Questionnaires:	44

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	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	27
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2 B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1 C 13	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 8		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	161
Questionnaires:	80

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	21	30	25	3.94	1188/1520	4.04	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	12	22	40	4.18	964/1520	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	15	21	40	4.20	851/1291	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	6	18	19	24	3.87	1147/1483	3.88	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	19	0	10	16	15	17	3.67	1090/1417	3.62	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	39	2	1	10	14	12	3.85	1010/1405	3.74	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	15	20	36	4.08	940/1504	4.21	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	75	4.97	178/1519	4.88	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	3	4	10	27	14	3.78	1121/1495	3.97	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	3	9	13	49	4.41	953/1459	4.42	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	7	10	57	4.64	1072/1460	4.79	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	5	16	22	30	3.97	1101/1455	4.21	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	7	7	20	40	4.21	981/1456	4.32	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	38	4	8	9	6	8	3.17	1181/1316	3.50	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	17	6	17	19	14	3.10	1179/1243	3.18	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	13	13	18	15	14	3.05	1202/1241	3.43	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	11	11	20	16	15	3.18	1194/1236	3.47	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.18
4. Were special techniques successful	7	45	7	4	8	4	5	2.86	854/889	2.94	3.38	4.02	3.89	2.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	161
Questionnaires:	80

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	63	3	2	0	5	4	3	3.43	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	5	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	2	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	4	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	3	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	71	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	71	3	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	3	0	4	0	3	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	3	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	70	4	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	161
Questionnaires:	80

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	2	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	71	2	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 3	A 15	Required for Majors	49
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 17	General	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 5		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 14		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 11
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	89
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	8	14	14	3.85	1247/1520	4.04	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	14	16	3.98	1116/1520	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.20	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	9	14	14	3.90	1033/1291	4.16	4.31	4.33	4.24	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	9	12	9	3.88	1141/1483	3.88	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	3	8	8	7	3.63	1125/1417	3.62	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	2	1	8	2	7	3.55	1172/1405	3.74	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	10	21	4.20	814/1504	4.21	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	1	1	37	4.78	817/1519	4.88	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	5	17	9	3.97	943/1495	3.97	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	7	9	22	4.22	1124/1459	4.42	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	36	4.85	675/1460	4.79	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	19	16	4.23	946/1455	4.21	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	7	9	21	4.23	963/1456	4.32	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	3	3	7	4	12	3.66	992/1316	3.50	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	5	11	8	7	3.03	1185/1243	3.18	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	4	16	7	8	3.28	1173/1241	3.43	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	9	14	10	3.73	1072/1236	3.47	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	3	20	1	4	8	3	2	3.06	819/889	2.94	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 11
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	89
Questionnaires:	41

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	32	2	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	2	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	2	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	2	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	2	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	2	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	1	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	2	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 11
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	89
Questionnaires:	41

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	34	2	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 3	A 13	Required for Majors	32
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 5	C 10	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	176
Questionnaires:	113

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	14	36	59	4.32	862/1520	3.95	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	22	87	4.73	283/1520	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	31	74	4.59	462/1291	3.82	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	34	0	3	5	32	39	4.35	691/1483	3.92	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	37	10	7	21	17	21	3.42	1217/1417	3.37	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	74	1	2	4	12	19	4.21	697/1405	3.78	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	26	80	4.63	301/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	5.00	1/1519	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	4	35	61	4.57	288/1495	4.10	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	13	99	4.88	234/1459	4.61	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	107	4.95	326/1460	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	30	79	4.67	450/1455	4.31	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	18	92	4.79	342/1456	4.31	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	43	1	5	11	21	32	4.11	659/1316	3.62	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	21	19	28	18	16	2.89	1205/1243	3.74	3.70	4.17	3.98	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	13	21	30	19	19	3.10	1198/1241	3.32	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	9	9	27	29	26	3.54	1130/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	13	74	7	2	8	5	4	2.88	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	176
Questionnaires:	113

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	106	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	107	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	108	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	109	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	111	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	112	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	108	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	108	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	108	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	108	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	176
Questionnaires:	113

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	29	0.00-0.99	0 A 46	Required for Majors	99
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	1 B 27		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6 C 23	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7 D 4		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	29 F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 10		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	171
Questionnaires:	90

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	38	27	20	3.68	1337/1520	3.95	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	19	27	35	3.94	1147/1520	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.20	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	7	18	19	29	13	3.27	1243/1291	3.82	4.31	4.33	4.24	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	2	7	16	26	17	3.72	1225/1483	3.92	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	33	9	7	20	11	9	3.07	1334/1417	3.37	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	52	3	4	15	7	8	3.35	1259/1405	3.78	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	10	32	41	4.32	681/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	0	85	4.97	237/1519	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	1	2	10	35	21	4.06	856/1495	4.10	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	5	13	24	46	4.26	1085/1459	4.61	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	7	76	4.82	779/1460	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	4	11	28	39	4.17	989/1455	4.31	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	7	8	31	41	4.22	981/1456	4.31	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	8	18	21	25	3.88	847/1316	3.62	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	13	16	13	20	20	3.22	1154/1243	3.74	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	27	18	19	8	10	2.46	1229/1241	3.32	3.84	4.33	4.14	2.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	12	17	23	13	17	3.07	1204/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.07
4. Were special techniques successful	9	63	4	4	5	3	2	2.72	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	171
Questionnaires:	90

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	83	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	84	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	84	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	84	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	84	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	85	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	85	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	85	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	86	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	86	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	85	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	85	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	171
Questionnaires:	90

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	85	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	85	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	31	0.00-0.99 3	A 14	Required for Majors 78	Graduate 0 Major
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 41		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 8	C 27	General 7	Under-grad 90 Non-major 85
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 1	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Gloor,Philip J.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	73
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	11	6	3.88	1235/1520	3.95	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	10	7	4.00	1086/1520	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	13	6	3.87	1051/1291	3.82	4.31	4.33	4.24	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1078/1483	3.92	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	1	3	7	4	3.44	1209/1417	3.37	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1071/1405	3.78	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	11	8	4.14	882/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	22	4.83	753/1519	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	849/1495	4.10	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	356/1459	4.61	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	648/1460	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	784/1455	4.31	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	14	4.27	927/1456	4.31	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	3	2	1	3	3	3.08	1203/1316	3.62	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1243	3.74	3.70	4.17	3.98	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	770/1241	3.32	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	649/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	73
Questionnaires:	24

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	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	73
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2 A 8	Required for Majors	20 Graduate 0 Major
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0 C 6	General	1 Under-grad 24 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	168
Questionnaires:	79

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	4	18	19	33	3.94	1188/1520	3.95	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	8	15	27	26	3.82	1235/1520	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.20	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	10	17	19	25	3.54	1172/1291	3.82	4.31	4.33	4.24	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	6	8	11	18	22	3.65	1263/1483	3.92	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	9	5	10	20	19	3.56	1163/1417	3.37	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	3	2	9	16	13	3.79	1048/1405	3.78	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	0	10	22	40	4.28	715/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	6	68	4.92	532/1519	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	3	3	19	21	16	3.71	1174/1495	4.10	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	8	16	49	4.48	859/1459	4.61	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	4	7	62	4.71	1001/1460	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	3	15	21	32	4.03	1065/1455	4.31	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	6	16	12	36	3.95	1140/1456	4.31	4.28	4.34	4.26	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	38	6	4	7	6	12	3.40	1106/1316	3.62	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	3	12	25	4.46	449/1243	3.74	3.70	4.17	3.98	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	2	6	13	10	9	3.45	1146/1241	3.32	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	1	2	9	13	16	4.00	947/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	38	22	5	6	3	2	3	2.58	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	168
Questionnaires:	79

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	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	77	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	2	A	24	Required for Majors	56	Graduate	0	Major	:
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	13	General	3	Under-grad	79	Non-major	7:
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	2				
				?	16						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



2

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	838/1520	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	809/1520	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	974/1291	4.00	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1483	4.60	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	540/1417	4.33	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	126/1504	4.83	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	891/1495	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	727/1460	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	761/1455	4.40	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	503/1456	4.67	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	405/1243	4.50	3.70	4.17	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	564/1241	4.50	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

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
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	302/1236	4.83	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	129
Questionnaires:	62

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	12	10	36	4.28	904/1520	4.26	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	14	44	4.61	429/1520	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	9	44	4.57	483/1291	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	1	0	3	15	21	4.38	669/1483	4.27	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	1	7	5	16	3.85	978/1417	3.73	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	35	2	1	1	8	14	4.19	716/1405	3.97	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	18	38	4.52	415/1504	4.46	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	60	5.00	1/1519	4.98	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	5	16	31	4.43	444/1495	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	12	44	4.67	616/1459	4.72	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	55	4.88	596/1460	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	12	43	4.60	525/1455	4.50	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	4	50	4.65	516/1456	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	28	2	2	4	5	19	4.16	627/1316	4.06	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	8	12	14	19	3.63	1004/1243	3.58	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	8	13	14	20	3.79	1044/1241	3.51	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	4	10	14	21	3.83	1041/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	23	6	6	7	9	6	3.09	818/889	3.27	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.09

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	129
Questionnaires:	62

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	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	129
Questionnaires:	62

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	58	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	16	General	2	Under-grad	62	Non-major	51
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

3

1

4

4

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	129
Questionnaires:	62

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	12	10	36	4.28	904/1520	4.26	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	14	44	4.61	429/1520	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	9	44	4.57	483/1291	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	1	0	3	15	21	4.38	669/1483	4.27	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	1	7	5	16	3.85	978/1417	3.73	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	35	2	1	1	8	14	4.19	716/1405	3.97	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	18	38	4.52	415/1504	4.46	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	60	5.00	1/1519	4.98	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	56	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1495	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1459	4.72	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	60	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1460	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	60	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1455	4.50	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1456	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	4.06	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	8	12	14	19	3.63	1004/1243	3.58	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	8	13	14	20	3.79	1044/1241	3.51	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	4	10	14	21	3.83	1041/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	23	6	6	7	9	6	3.09	818/889	3.27	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.09

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	129
Questionnaires:	62

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	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Sharma,Neeraj

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	129
Questionnaires:	62

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	58	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	16	General	2	Under-grad	62	Non-major	51
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

3

3

3

4

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	83

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	12	36	30	4.10	1064/1520	4.26	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	29	45	4.39	747/1520	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	6	27	43	4.25	816/1291	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	1	0	13	18	29	4.21	842/1483	4.27	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	2	13	22	21	3.92	919/1417	3.73	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	39	1	2	5	18	16	4.10	798/1405	3.97	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	8	26	43	4.32	669/1504	4.46	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	3	78	4.94	414/1519	4.98	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	1	0	6	32	22	4.21	706/1495	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	18	62	4.73	498/1459	4.72	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	74	4.90	544/1460	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	9	27	44	4.40	772/1455	4.50	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	6	23	46	4.34	866/1456	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	40	3	2	9	8	16	3.84	865/1316	4.06	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	3	21	17	28	3.81	897/1243	3.58	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	12	6	20	16	21	3.37	1161/1241	3.51	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	7	11	25	27	3.83	1045/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	45	5	3	6	7	7	3.29	770/889	3.27	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	83

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	76	1	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	77	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	82	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	83

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	68	Graduate	0	Major	(
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	11	C	24	General	0	Under-grad	83	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	2	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	7	23	4.37	802/1520	4.26	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	11	20	4.32	822/1520	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	10	20	4.27	802/1291	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	4	1	7	12	4.13	938/1483	4.27	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	5	1	9	3	8	3.31	1266/1417	3.73	3.89	4.08	4.02	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	3	2	2	5	5	3.41	1236/1405	3.97	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	12	20	4.49	463/1504	4.46	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1519	4.98	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	1	11	13	4.35	556/1495	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	463/1459	4.72	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	34	4.89	570/1460	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	9	24	4.51	625/1455	4.50	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	30	4.70	453/1456	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	619/1316	4.06	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	7	10	6	8	3.26	1138/1243	3.58	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	10	5	9	6	3.09	1199/1241	3.51	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	3	6	8	12	3.64	1102/1236	3.78	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	23	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	666/889	3.27	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	38

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	31	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	29
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 14		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1 C 4	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 1	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



4

4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	148
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	35	4.60	479/1520	4.64	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	37	4.69	333/1520	4.61	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	10	33	4.60	452/1291	4.66	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	5	10	24	4.43	607/1483	4.36	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	7	10	21	4.23	641/1417	4.11	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	2	8	8	14	3.97	890/1405	3.85	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	5	35	4.54	394/1504	4.56	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	32	14	4.25	1314/1519	4.57	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	2	12	21	4.47	390/1495	4.50	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	41	4.83	321/1459	4.83	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	44	4.91	489/1460	4.91	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	7	10	29	4.43	736/1455	4.51	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	6	34	4.53	651/1456	4.52	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	4	2	3	6	11	3.69	971/1316	3.90	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	1	10	8	17	3.69	970/1243	3.32	3.70	4.17	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	5	11	9	15	3.71	1072/1241	3.65	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	0	7	8	22	4.07	926/1236	3.84	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	6	21	1	3	4	4	9	3.81	601/889	3.77	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.81

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	148
Questionnaires:	48

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	24	0	6	3	5	5	5	3.00	151/164	2.89	3.82	4.15	4.13	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	2	4	8	8	3.87	123/165	3.58	4.16	4.19	4.31	3.87
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	118/160	4.12	4.36	4.45	4.49	4.32
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	92/158	4.22	4.35	4.36	4.43	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	58/150	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.26	4.35
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	148
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1 A 15	Required for Majors	34
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 21		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1 C 4	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 8		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 02
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	88
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	26	4.68	386/1520	4.64	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	24	4.54	527/1520	4.61	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	28	4.73	325/1291	4.66	4.31	4.33	4.24	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	2	10	16	4.30	747/1483	4.36	4.19	4.23	4.09	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	5	4	5	14	4.00	803/1417	4.11	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	3	1	3	7	8	3.73	1087/1405	3.85	4.13	4.12	3.96	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	11	23	4.58	352/1504	4.56	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	632/1519	4.57	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	20	4.53	324/1495	4.50	4.01	4.11	4.01	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	339/1459	4.83	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	33	4.91	489/1460	4.91	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	6	25	4.59	547/1455	4.51	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	4	25	4.51	672/1456	4.52	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	659/1316	3.90	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	12	6	2	4	12	2.94	1197/1243	3.32	3.70	4.17	3.98	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	4	8	7	13	3.58	1115/1241	3.65	3.84	4.33	4.14	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	4	11	3	14	3.60	1114/1236	3.84	3.92	4.40	4.19	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	2	3	4	3	10	3.73	629/889	3.77	3.38	4.02	3.89	3.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 02
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	88
Questionnaires:	37

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	22	1	4	1	6	0	3	2.79	160/164	2.89	3.82	4.15	4.13	2.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	4	6	0	4	3.29	152/165	3.58	4.16	4.19	4.31	3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	145/160	4.12	4.36	4.45	4.49	3.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	119/158	4.22	4.35	4.36	4.43	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	110/150	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.26	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 02
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	88
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	34	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	1	Major	(
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

7

7

7

0

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155B 01
Title:	Calc Trigonometric Func
Instructor:	Muscedere,Micha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1341/1520	3.67	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	972/1520	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1136/1291	3.67	4.31	4.33	4.24	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1165/1483	3.83	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	540/1417	4.33	3.89	4.08	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	506/1405	4.40	4.13	4.12	3.96	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	848/1504	4.17	4.36	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1136/1495	3.75	4.01	4.11	4.01	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1156/1459	4.17	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1195/1460	4.50	4.73	4.74	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	989/1455	4.17	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1094/1456	4.00	4.28	4.34	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	624/1243	4.25	3.70	4.17	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	770/1241	4.25	3.84	4.33	4.14	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	829/1236	4.25	3.92	4.40	4.19	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155B 01
Title:	Calc Trigonometric Func
Instructor:	Muscedere,Micha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155B 01
Title:	Calc Trigonometric Func
Instructor:	Muscedere,Micha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	104
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	8	22	4.10	1064/1520	4.10	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	4	7	25	4.27	884/1520	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	5	8	23	4.20	858/1291	4.20	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	3	2	7	3	14	3.79	1188/1483	3.79	4.19	4.23	4.28	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	2	4	10	11	4.00	803/1417	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	7	27	4.45	503/1504	4.45	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	9	29	4.69	922/1519	4.69	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	3	2	5	10	8	3.64	1217/1495	3.64	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	34	4.76	463/1459	4.76	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	1	7	30	4.54	1172/1460	4.54	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	8	29	4.51	625/1455	4.51	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	7	25	4.29	909/1456	4.29	4.28	4.34	4.46	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	31	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	2	6	2	9	3.80	903/1243	3.80	3.70	4.17	4.22	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	9	1	4	2	5	2.67	1224/1241	2.67	3.84	4.33	4.38	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	8	1	3	1	8	3.00	1206/1236	3.00	3.92	4.40	4.45	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	23	15	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	104
Questionnaires:	42

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	35	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	104
Questionnaires:	42

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	37	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 12	Required for Majors	37
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1 B 17		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 8	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6 D 3		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	9	16	13	3.81	1271/1520	3.92	4.21	4.31	4.36	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	9	14	13	3.70	1306/1520	4.04	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	2	7	13	10	3.71	1116/1291	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.44	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	3	6	7	10	3.71	1230/1483	4.04	4.19	4.23	4.28	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	5	5	8	5	9	3.25	1285/1417	3.91	3.89	4.08	4.14	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	8	7	10	4.08	803/1405	4.05	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	9	11	18	3.95	1050/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.15	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	37	4.86	672/1519	4.97	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	3	9	13	9	3.74	1144/1495	3.67	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	5	7	13	14	3.85	1304/1459	4.41	4.48	4.47	4.52	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	10	30	4.75	903/1460	4.77	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	5	5	14	13	3.73	1253/1455	3.99	4.19	4.32	4.39	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	7	4	13	13	3.65	1269/1456	3.96	4.28	4.34	4.46	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	28	1	1	5	2	4	3.54	1045/1316	3.32	3.84	4.03	4.18	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1076/1243	3.66	3.70	4.17	4.22	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	989/1241	4.20	3.84	4.33	4.38	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	819/1236	4.14	3.92	4.40	4.45	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	32	8	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	40
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 6	C 3	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1302/1520	3.92	4.21	4.31	4.36	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	893/1520	4.04	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	894/1291	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1483	4.04	4.19	4.23	4.28	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	986/1417	3.91	3.89	4.08	4.14	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1043/1405	4.05	4.13	4.12	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	190/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1365/1495	3.67	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	534/1459	4.41	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	981/1460	4.77	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1191/1455	3.99	4.19	4.32	4.39	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1027/1456	3.96	4.28	4.34	4.46	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1316	3.32	3.84	4.03	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1243	3.66	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.20	3.84	4.33	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.14	3.92	4.40	4.45	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	9	7	7	3.59	1367/1520	3.92	4.21	4.31	4.36	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	9	8	3.78	1263/1520	4.04	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	8	13	4.23	830/1291	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	949/1483	4.04	4.19	4.23	4.28	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	0	8	12	4.26	605/1417	3.91	3.89	4.08	4.14	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1002/1405	4.05	4.13	4.12	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	5	12	4.04	974/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	4	10	3	3.41	1321/1495	3.67	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	1	7	15	4.22	1116/1459	4.41	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	1012/1460	4.77	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	4	10	7	3.65	1277/1455	3.99	4.19	4.32	4.39	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	5	6	8	3.46	1322/1456	3.96	4.28	4.34	4.46	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	2	3	0	1	2.71	1264/1316	3.32	3.84	4.03	4.18	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/1243	3.66	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/1241	4.20	3.84	4.33	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1236	4.14	3.92	4.40	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	24
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	581/1520	3.92	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	695/1520	4.04	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	1	15	4.45	621/1291	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	757/1483	4.04	4.19	4.23	4.28	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	560/1417	3.91	3.89	4.08	4.14	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	421/1405	4.05	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	321/1504	4.34	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	684/1495	3.67	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	286/1459	4.41	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	544/1460	4.77	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	387/1455	3.99	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	610/1456	3.96	4.28	4.34	4.46	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	958/1316	3.32	3.84	4.03	4.18	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	865/1243	3.66	3.70	4.17	4.22	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	564/1241	4.20	3.84	4.33	4.38	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	947/1236	4.14	3.92	4.40	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	21

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	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	37
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														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	16 Graduate 0 Major
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0 C 3	General	2 Under-grad 21 Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 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	1
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

7

7

7

4

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	115/1520	4.90	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	349/1291	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1483	4.83	4.19	4.23	4.28	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	229/1417	4.67	3.89	4.08	4.14	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1043/1405	3.80	4.13	4.12	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	694/1504	4.30	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	457/1495	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	234/1459	4.89	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1455	4.67	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.28	4.34	4.46	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.84	4.03	4.18	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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			
				?	3					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Potra,Florian A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	12	16	4.21	975/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	10	8	13	3.88	1200/1520	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	20	4.47	591/1291	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	2	5	2	11	4.10	960/1483	3.77	4.19	4.23	4.28	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	5	9	10	3.96	854/1417	3.51	3.89	4.08	4.14	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	733/1405	4.13	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	7	16	4.03	974/1504	4.14	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	9	4.26	1307/1519	4.73	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	10	12	5	3.60	1247/1495	3.30	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	10	9	10	3.67	1361/1459	3.89	4.48	4.47	4.52	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	6	6	19	4.27	1330/1460	4.48	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	7	11	6	7	3.27	1367/1455	3.41	4.19	4.32	4.39	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	6	11	4	10	3.42	1333/1456	3.70	4.28	4.34	4.46	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	22	1	2	2	0	4	3.44	1086/1316	3.04	3.84	4.03	4.18	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1151/1243	3.22	3.70	4.17	4.22	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	998/1241	3.89	3.84	4.33	4.38	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	1173/1236	3.33	3.92	4.40	4.45	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	26	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 29	Graduate 0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 34 Non-major 29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



5

9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	12	3	3.77	1292/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.36	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	8	3	3.32	1425/1520	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	11	2	4	3.09	1258/1291	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.44	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1318/1483	3.77	4.19	4.23	4.28	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1070/1417	3.51	3.89	4.08	4.14	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	843/1405	4.13	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	8	9	4.09	924/1504	4.14	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1519	4.73	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	3	11	2	0	2.63	1474/1495	3.30	4.01	4.11	4.16	2.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	6	5	3	6	3.23	1420/1459	3.89	4.48	4.47	4.52	3.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	1231/1460	4.48	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	3	7	5	2	2.82	1426/1455	3.41	4.19	4.32	4.39	2.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	6	5	3.27	1365/1456	3.70	4.28	4.34	4.46	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/1316	3.04	3.84	4.03	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1243	3.22	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1241	3.89	3.84	4.33	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1236	3.33	3.92	4.40	4.45	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	20
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0 B 10		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 4	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



5

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Minkoff,Susan E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	1	10	22	4.35	814/1520	4.11	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	14	17	4.19	956/1520	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	18	4.30	788/1291	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	2	0	5	10	4	3.67	1254/1483	3.77	4.19	4.23	4.28	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	21	4	2	4	2	3	2.87	1381/1417	3.51	3.89	4.08	4.14	2.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	697/1405	4.13	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	15	16	4.31	694/1504	4.14	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	532/1519	4.73	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	2	7	11	7	3.66	1210/1495	3.30	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	29	4.77	427/1459	3.89	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	981/1460	4.48	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	6	9	17	4.14	1002/1455	3.41	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	7	22	4.40	788/1456	3.70	4.28	4.34	4.46	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	3	9	4	5	1	2.64	1271/1316	3.04	3.84	4.03	4.18	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1243	3.22	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1241	3.89	3.84	4.33	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Minkoff,Susan E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	****/1236	3.33	3.92	4.40	4.45	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	28
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 10	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



5

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	14	18	4.25	924/1520	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	11	21	4.30	847/1520	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	8	22	4.23	837/1291	4.29	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	4	4	4	9	3.73	1225/1483	3.94	4.19	4.23	4.28	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	2	8	5	11	3.85	971/1417	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.14	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	2	6	6	10	4.00	843/1405	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	10	8	21	4.23	781/1504	4.39	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	178/1519	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	3	12	10	6	3.61	1239/1495	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	6	28	4.53	808/1459	4.70	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	3	34	4.75	903/1460	4.81	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	10	9	18	4.03	1065/1455	4.29	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	7	5	19	3.97	1117/1456	4.38	4.28	4.34	4.46	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	976/1316	3.94	3.84	4.03	4.18	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	32	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	40

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	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	40

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	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	:
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	3:
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

7

7

7

3

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	276/1520	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	415/1520	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	462/1291	4.29	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1135/1483	3.94	4.19	4.23	4.28	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	2	4	4	3.69	1076/1417	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.14	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	742/1405	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	91/1504	4.39	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	759/1495	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	463/1459	4.70	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	381/1460	4.81	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	637/1455	4.29	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	11	4.38	821/1456	4.38	4.28	4.34	4.46	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	383/1316	3.94	3.84	4.03	4.18	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	;
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1!
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



2

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	15	4.43	710/1520	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	847/1520	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	10	4.04	954/1291	4.29	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1141/1483	3.94	4.19	4.23	4.28	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	761/1417	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.14	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	961/1405	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.13	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	7	13	4.35	644/1504	4.39	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	0	8	12	4.22	1342/1519	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	3	9	4	3.94	969/1495	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.16	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	696/1459	4.70	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	1108/1460	4.81	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	2	13	4.29	894/1455	4.29	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	810/1456	4.38	4.28	4.34	4.46	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	627/1316	3.94	3.84	4.03	4.18	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	54
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	17
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



4

9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	10	27	4.73	323/1520	4.54	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	13	22	4.54	527/1520	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	16	16	4.31	782/1291	4.29	4.31	4.33	4.44	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	800/1483	3.94	4.19	4.23	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	14	2	3	5	8	3	3.33	1253/1417	3.74	3.89	4.08	4.14	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	615/1405	4.09	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	7	10	17	4.11	916/1504	4.39	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1519	4.80	4.83	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	14	19	4.53	333/1495	4.06	4.01	4.11	4.16	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	216/1459	4.70	4.48	4.47	4.52	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	326/1460	4.81	4.73	4.74	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	17	17	4.35	819/1455	4.29	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	30	4.81	303/1456	4.38	4.28	4.34	4.46	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	5	1	1	5	8	3.50	1057/1316	3.94	3.84	4.03	4.18	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	35	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	!
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	3:
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



5

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1118/1520	4.23	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	809/1520	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1064/1291	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.32	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	895/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1187/1417	3.80	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1405	4.35	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	437/1504	4.32	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1129/1519	4.52	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1099/1495	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1156/1459	4.15	4.48	4.47	4.47	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	806/1460	4.65	4.73	4.74	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1202/1455	4.03	4.19	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1203/1456	4.10	4.28	4.34	4.32	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 301 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 16
Title: Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires: 6
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	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.07	3.84	4.03	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1188/1520	4.23	4.21	4.31	4.33	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1396/1520	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1151/1291	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.32	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	874/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	755/1417	3.80	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	784/1405	4.35	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1125/1504	4.32	4.36	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	2	4.06	1417/1519	4.52	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1317/1495	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.07	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	7	2	4	3.31	1413/1459	4.15	4.48	4.47	4.47	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	1360/1460	4.65	4.73	4.74	4.72	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	5	1	6	3.44	1337/1455	4.03	4.19	4.32	4.31	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1279/1456	4.10	4.28	4.34	4.32	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	1301/1316	4.07	3.84	4.03	4.08	2.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1214/1243	2.80	3.70	4.17	4.16	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1206/1241	3.00	3.84	4.33	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1217/1236	2.80	3.92	4.40	4.41	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	16

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	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	16

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	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	(
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	300/1520	4.23	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	306/1520	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	302/1291	4.07	4.31	4.33	4.32	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	222/1483	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	994/1417	3.80	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	575/1405	4.35	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	24	4.58	352/1504	4.32	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1519	4.52	4.83	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	147/1495	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.07	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	80/1459	4.15	4.48	4.47	4.47	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	218/1460	4.65	4.73	4.74	4.72	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	236/1455	4.03	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	280/1456	4.10	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1316	4.07	3.84	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1243	2.80	3.70	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1241	3.00	3.84	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1236	2.80	3.92	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	17
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



4

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	790/1520	4.38	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	760/1520	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	483/1291	4.56	4.31	4.33	4.32	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	607/1483	4.43	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	229/1417	4.67	3.89	4.08	4.07	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	606/1504	4.38	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1417/1519	4.06	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	770/1495	4.15	4.01	4.11	4.07	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	356/1459	4.81	4.48	4.47	4.47	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1150/1460	4.56	4.73	4.74	4.72	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	911/1455	4.27	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	945/1456	4.25	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	3.84	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1118/1520	4.00	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	1388/1520	3.46	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	974/1291	4.00	4.31	4.33	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1406/1483	3.27	4.19	4.23	4.25	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	2	3	2	2.92	1375/1417	2.92	3.89	4.08	4.07	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1309/1405	3.18	4.13	4.12	4.13	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	489/1504	4.46	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1371/1519	4.17	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	5	3	0	2.75	1464/1495	2.75	4.01	4.11	4.07	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1383/1459	3.54	4.48	4.47	4.47	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1278/1460	4.38	4.73	4.74	4.72	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	4	3	1	2.85	1423/1455	2.85	4.19	4.32	4.31	2.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	6	1	3.08	1396/1456	3.08	4.28	4.34	4.32	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	830/1316	3.90	3.84	4.03	4.08	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1187/1243	3.00	3.70	4.17	4.16	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1215/1241	2.86	3.84	4.33	4.34	2.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1041/1236	3.83	3.92	4.40	4.41	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 2	Required for Majors	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 5	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



0

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	7	10	3.85	1247/1520	3.85	4.21	4.31	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	17	4.33	809/1520	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	15	4.44	636/1291	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.32	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	550/1483	4.47	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	955/1417	3.88	3.89	4.08	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	535/1405	4.38	4.13	4.12	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	321/1504	4.62	4.36	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	713/1519	4.85	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	4	13	1	3.60	1247/1495	3.60	4.01	4.11	4.07	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	772/1459	4.56	4.48	4.47	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	5	20	4.59	1127/1460	4.59	4.73	4.74	4.72	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	9	15	4.37	795/1455	4.37	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	4	17	4.31	900/1456	4.31	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1163/1316	3.23	3.84	4.03	4.08	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	27

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	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
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	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 390 02
Title:	Special Topics In Math
Instructor:	Meskin,Stephen

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.31	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1417	5.00	3.89	4.08	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.13	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1129/1519	4.50	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1495	4.75	4.01	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.48	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	334/1455	4.75	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.28	4.34	4.32	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 390 02
Title:	Special Topics In Math
Instructor:	Meskin,Stephen

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	3.84	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



2

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	6	4	3.71	1322/1520	4.25	4.21	4.31	4.44	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	5	0	2.93	1491/1520	3.69	4.27	4.27	4.32	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	6	2	3.14	1254/1291	3.82	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1356/1483	3.86	4.19	4.23	4.33	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	1	2	2	0	2.00	1409/1417	3.08	3.89	4.08	4.12	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1292/1405	3.93	4.13	4.12	4.25	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1272/1504	4.17	4.36	4.16	4.21	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.83	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	2	3	6	0	2.86	1451/1495	3.49	4.01	4.11	4.21	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	3	5	2	3.31	1414/1459	4.05	4.48	4.47	4.54	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	435/1460	4.93	4.73	4.74	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	1	7	0	1	2.46	1445/1455	3.33	4.19	4.32	4.37	2.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	2	3	4	3.23	1375/1456	3.92	4.28	4.34	4.41	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1316	4.50	3.84	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	1085/1243	4.01	3.70	4.17	4.42	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	852/1241	4.37	3.84	4.33	4.56	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1034/1236	3.93	3.92	4.40	4.64	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	5	Major	:
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3 C 3	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	5	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



3

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	265/1520	4.25	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	667/1520	3.69	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	546/1291	3.82	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	778/1483	3.86	4.19	4.23	4.33	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	692/1417	3.08	3.89	4.08	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	275/1405	3.93	4.13	4.12	4.25	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	233/1504	4.17	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1519	4.97	4.83	4.70	4.70	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	811/1495	3.49	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	374/1459	4.05	4.48	4.47	4.54	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	381/1460	4.93	4.73	4.74	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	964/1455	3.33	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	579/1456	3.92	4.28	4.34	4.41	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	312/1316	4.50	3.84	4.03	4.12	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	339/1243	4.01	3.70	4.17	4.42	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1241	4.37	3.84	4.33	4.56	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	947/1236	3.93	3.92	4.40	4.64	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	18

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.36	4.45	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.35	4.36	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.00	4.05	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.21	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.04	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	2.94	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 3 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	3	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



5

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	265/1520	4.78	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	772/1520	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	591/1291	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	201/1483	4.78	4.19	4.23	4.33	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	749/1417	4.09	3.89	4.08	4.12	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	211/1405	4.69	4.13	4.12	4.25	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	301/1504	4.63	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1273/1519	4.32	4.83	4.70	4.70	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	568/1495	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	119/1459	4.95	4.48	4.47	4.54	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	845/1460	4.79	4.73	4.74	4.78	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	8	9	4.26	911/1455	4.26	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	662/1456	4.53	4.28	4.34	4.41	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 410 01
Title:	Intro Complex Analysis
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	695/1520	4.44	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1086/1520	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	1042/1291	3.89	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1183/1483	3.80	4.19	4.23	4.33	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	362/1417	4.50	3.89	4.08	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.13	4.12	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	311/1504	4.63	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1349/1495	3.33	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1116/1459	4.22	4.48	4.47	4.54	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1303/1460	4.33	4.73	4.74	4.78	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1351/1455	3.38	4.19	4.32	4.37	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	0	1	3	3.11	1392/1456	3.11	4.28	4.34	4.41	3.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	903/1243	3.80	3.70	4.17	4.42	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	666/1241	4.40	3.84	4.33	4.56	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 410 01
Title:	Intro Complex Analysis
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	15
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														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	725/1236	4.40	3.92	4.40	4.64	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



4

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 421 01
Title:	Introduction To Topology
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1512/1520	2.43	4.21	4.31	4.44	2.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	2.43	1510/1520	2.43	4.27	4.27	4.32	2.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	4.31	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1447/1483	3.00	4.19	4.23	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	803/1417	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1398/1405	2.00	4.13	4.12	4.25	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1478/1504	2.50	4.36	4.16	4.21	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	4	0	1	1	1	2.29	1490/1495	2.29	4.01	4.11	4.21	2.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1415/1459	3.29	4.48	4.47	4.54	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1439/1460	3.71	4.73	4.74	4.78	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	0	1	1	1	2.29	1451/1455	2.29	4.19	4.32	4.37	2.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	2	0	1	2.14	1452/1456	2.14	4.28	4.34	4.41	2.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 421 01
Title:	Introduction To Topology
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



7

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Liu,Xing

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	954/1520	4.22	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	513/1520	4.56	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	267/1291	4.78	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1010/1483	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	659/1417	4.20	3.89	4.08	4.12	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.13	4.12	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	384/1504	4.56	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	891/1495	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	427/1459	4.78	4.48	4.47	4.54	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1048/1460	4.67	4.73	4.74	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	711/1455	4.44	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1039/1456	4.13	4.28	4.34	4.41	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 430 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 13
Title: Matrix Analysis		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Liu,Xing		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



5

4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 441 01
Title:	Intro Numerical Analysis
Instructor:	Minkoff,Susan E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	944/1520	4.23	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	1086/1520	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	1021/1291	3.92	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1334/1483	3.50	4.19	4.23	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1187/1417	3.50	3.89	4.08	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1331/1405	3.00	4.13	4.12	4.25	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	770/1504	4.23	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1519	4.77	4.83	4.70	4.70	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1075/1495	3.83	4.01	4.11	4.21	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	886/1459	4.46	4.48	4.47	4.54	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1108/1460	4.62	4.73	4.74	4.78	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1042/1455	4.08	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1155/1456	3.92	4.28	4.34	4.41	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1301/1316	2.20	3.84	4.03	4.12	2.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	624/1243	4.25	3.70	4.17	4.42	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	922/1241	4.00	3.84	4.33	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	947/1236	4.00	3.92	4.40	4.64	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 441 01
Title:	Intro Numerical Analysis
Instructor:	Minkoff,Susan E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1363/1520	3.60	4.21	4.31	4.44	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1247/1520	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	974/1291	4.00	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1483	****	4.19	4.23	4.33	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1417	****	3.89	4.08	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.13	4.12	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	331/1504	4.60	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	891/1495	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1028/1459	4.33	4.48	4.47	4.54	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1274/1455	3.67	4.19	4.32	4.37	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1265/1456	3.67	4.28	4.34	4.41	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



5

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	360/1520	4.69	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	541/1520	4.54	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1291	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	212/1483	4.77	4.19	4.23	4.33	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	3	5	3.67	1097/1417	3.67	3.89	4.08	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	162/1405	4.77	4.13	4.12	4.25	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	242/1504	4.69	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1519	4.77	4.83	4.70	4.70	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	532/1495	4.36	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	568/1459	4.69	4.48	4.47	4.54	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	884/1460	4.77	4.73	4.74	4.78	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	226/1455	4.85	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	269/1456	4.85	4.28	4.34	4.41	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	163/1316	4.73	3.84	4.03	4.12	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 481 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 17
Title: Math Modeling		Questionnaires: 13
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															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 490 01
Title:	Special Topics In Math
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	185/1520	4.86	4.21	4.31	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.31	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	263/1483	4.71	4.19	4.23	4.33	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1417	****	3.89	4.08	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	759/1405	4.14	4.13	4.12	4.25	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	542/1504	4.43	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	693/1519	4.86	4.83	4.70	4.70	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	110/1495	4.86	4.01	4.11	4.21	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.48	4.47	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	215/1455	4.86	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.28	4.34	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 490 01
Title:	Special Topics In Math
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 600 01
Title:	Real Analysis
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	666/1520	4.46	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	541/1520	4.54	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	111/1291	4.92	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	253/1483	4.73	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1273/1417	3.29	3.89	4.08	4.13	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1405	4.80	4.13	4.12	4.24	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	119/1504	4.85	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	661/1495	4.25	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	984/1459	4.38	4.48	4.47	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	884/1460	4.77	4.73	4.74	4.77	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	603/1455	4.54	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	566/1456	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	312/1316	4.50	3.84	4.03	3.86	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	624/1243	4.25	3.70	4.17	4.23	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	3.84	4.33	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	649/1236	4.50	3.92	4.40	4.47	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 600 01
Title:	Real Analysis
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 601 01
Title:	Measure Theory
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	2
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.31	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1417	5.00	3.89	4.08	4.13	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.13	4.12	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.01	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.48	4.47	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.19	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.28	4.34	4.32	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 601 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 2
Title: Measure Theory		Questionnaires: 2
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	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	3.84	4.03	3.86	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



1

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 603 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Zweck,John W

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	452/1520	4.63	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	415/1520	4.63	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	721/1291	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	842/1483	4.21	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	767/1417	4.07	3.89	4.08	4.13	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.13	4.12	4.24	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1070/1504	3.94	4.36	4.16	4.21	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.94	4.83	4.70	4.77	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	351/1495	4.50	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	356/1459	4.81	4.48	4.47	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	381/1460	4.94	4.73	4.74	4.77	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	723/1455	4.44	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	478/1456	4.69	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	889/1316	3.80	3.84	4.03	3.86	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	405/1243	4.50	3.70	4.17	4.23	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	5.00	3.84	4.33	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.92	4.40	4.47	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	334/889	4.25	3.38	4.02	4.06	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 603 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Zweck,John W

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

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	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	3.82	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.16	4.19	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 611 01
Title:	Applied Analysis
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	130/1520	4.89	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	232/1291	4.80	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1417	5.00	3.89	4.08	4.13	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.13	4.12	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	233/1504	4.70	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	130/1495	4.80	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	199/1459	4.90	4.48	4.47	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.19	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.28	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	3.84	4.03	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1060/1243	3.50	3.70	4.17	4.23	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1241	4.75	3.84	4.33	4.39	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 611 01
Title:	Applied Analysis
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1064/1236	3.75	3.92	4.40	4.47	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 614 01
Title:	Partial Differentl Eq
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1433/1520	3.43	4.21	4.31	4.39	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1356/1520	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1116/1291	3.71	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1010/1483	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	803/1417	4.00	3.89	4.08	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	575/1405	4.33	4.13	4.12	4.24	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1238/1504	3.71	4.36	4.16	4.21	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	693/1519	4.86	4.83	4.70	4.77	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	627/1495	4.29	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.48	4.47	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1048/1460	4.67	4.73	4.74	4.77	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	503/1456	4.67	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1106/1316	3.40	3.84	4.03	3.86	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.23	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.39	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 614 01
Title:	Partial Differentl Eq
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



4

3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 620 01
Title:	Numerical Analysis
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	276/1520	4.77	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	541/1520	4.54	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	606/1291	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	564/1483	4.45	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	540/1417	4.33	3.89	4.08	4.13	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	259/1405	4.64	4.13	4.12	4.24	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	182/1504	4.77	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1519	4.77	4.83	4.70	4.77	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	351/1495	4.50	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	886/1459	4.46	4.48	4.47	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	435/1460	4.92	4.73	4.74	4.77	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	877/1455	4.31	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	465/1456	4.69	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	248/1316	4.58	3.84	4.03	3.86	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1243	****	3.70	4.17	4.23	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	3.84	4.33	4.39	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 620 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 14
Title: Numerical Analysis		Questionnaires: 13
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															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	****	3.92	4.40	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 1		8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		5
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	0 F 0	Electives	0
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			1 ? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



2

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 650 01
Title:	Foundtns Of Optimization
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	504/1520	4.58	4.21	4.31	4.39	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	584/1520	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	504/1291	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	263/1483	4.71	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	540/1417	4.33	3.89	4.08	4.13	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	130/1405	4.82	4.13	4.12	4.24	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	126/1504	4.83	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1045/1519	4.58	4.83	4.70	4.77	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	532/1495	4.36	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	664/1459	4.64	4.48	4.47	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	806/1460	4.80	4.73	4.74	4.77	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	592/1455	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	315/1456	4.80	4.28	4.34	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	927/1316	3.75	3.84	4.03	3.86	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	934/1243	3.75	3.70	4.17	4.23	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	922/1241	4.00	3.84	4.33	4.39	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1064/1236	3.75	3.92	4.40	4.47	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 650 01
Title:	Foundtns Of Optimization
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.38	4.02	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires



3

4