```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0101           University of Maryland                              Page 1019
Title        INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH          Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  NEWTON, ROBERT                   Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires: 22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   1  10   6   3  3.32 1588/1670  3.58  4.22  4.31  4.23  3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   4   5   6   7  3.73 1424/1666  4.01  4.27  4.27  4.30  3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   4   7  11  4.32  823/1406  4.53  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8   2   1   3   5   3  3.43 1486/1615  3.68  4.15  4.24  4.17  3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   0   2   4   7   5  3.83 1078/1566  3.84  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12  0   0   2   3   4  4.22  733/1528  4.31  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   1   3   5  11  4.14 1032/1650  4.35  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   1   0   7  13  4.52 1142/1667  4.55  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 1   1   5   7   1  3.40 1438/1626  3.55  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.40


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   1   3   6   7  4.12 1249/1559  4.22  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   1   5   4   7  4.00 1467/1560  4.16  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   3   3   6   5  3.76 1303/1549  4.08  4.14  4.31  4.32  3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   0   0   4   5   8  4.24 1002/1546  4.35  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 12  0   1   4   0   1  3.17 1155/1323  3.17  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.17


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0   1   3   3   2   3  3.25 1200/1384  3.17  3.49  4.10  3.92  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0   2   1   4   2   3  3.25 1265/1378  3.63  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  1   4   1   3   3  3.25 1276/1378  3.54  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   8   0   0   3   0   1  3.50 ****/ 904  3.25  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0  0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 1  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18  4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 1  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    20   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                20   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97  3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20  0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       20   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   20   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 22   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   6   0.00-0.99   0   A   12   Required for Majors 14   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   2   1.00-1.99   1   B   4
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   5   C   1   General   0   Under-grad 22   Non-major   22
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0   responses to be significant
                                       I   0   Other   4
                                       ?   2

```
Course-Section: MATH 100  0201          University of Maryland                              Page 1020
Title          INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH      Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    NEWTON, ROBERT             Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 20                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  2  7  3  8  3.85 1379/1670  3.58 4.22  4.31 4.23  3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  2  4 12  4.30  908/1666  4.01 4.27  4.27 4.30  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  3 16  4.75  318/1406  4.53 4.33  4.32 4.31  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   6  1  1  3  2  7  3.93 1203/1615  3.68 4.15  4.24 4.17  3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  2  1  4  3  9  3.84 1068/1566  3.84 3.76  4.07 4.03  3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  560/1528  4.31 4.14  4.12 4.00  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  0  6 13  4.55  499/1650  4.35 4.29  4.22 4.28  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  8 11  4.58 1104/1667  4.55 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  2  1  1  9  4  3.71 1289/1626  3.55 3.99  4.11 4.07  3.71


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  1  0  1  7 10  4.32 1112/1559  4.22 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  1  2  6 10  4.32 1390/1560  4.16 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  2  0  5 11  4.39  840/1549  4.08 4.14  4.31 4.32  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  1  0  1  4 13  4.47  755/1546  4.35 4.33  4.32 4.32  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 14  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/1323  3.17 3.71  4.00 3.91  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  3  3  0  2  4  3.08 1256/1384  3.17 3.49  4.10 3.92  3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  1  1  1  3  6  4.00  970/1378  3.63 3.59  4.29 4.09  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  2  1  0  3  6  3.83 1076/1378  3.54 3.61  4.31 4.08  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   5  2  1  1  1  3  3.25  794/ 904  3.25 3.64  4.03 3.94  3.25


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     5      0.00-0.99    1       A    6       Required for Majors  13    Graduate      0      Major        0
28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0       B    6
56-83     0      2.00-2.99    3       C    6       General              0     Under-grad   20      Non-major   20
84-150    5      3.00-3.49    1       D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other                6
                                      ?    0
```

Title   ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 20   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  0  1  1  6  11  4.42  780/1670  4.25  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0  0  2  0  4  12  4.44  719/1666  4.52  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  2  2  15  4.68  399/1406  4.66  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   4  1  1  1  0  11  4.36  750/1615  4.28  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  6  0  0  2  3   8  4.46  429/1566  4.10  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  2  8  1  1  1  1   6  4.00  899/1528  3.88  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  1  1  0  2  15  4.53  541/1650  4.54  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1  0  0  1  0  17  4.89  712/1667  4.75  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4  1  1  1  1  4   8  4.13  865/1626  4.19  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.13

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  2  16  4.89  307/1559  4.76  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88  647/1560  4.80  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  3  0  0  2  1  3  11  4.35  876/1549  4.43  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4   0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75  407/1546  4.59  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  5  8  0  2  0  2   3  3.86  857/1323  3.72  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.86

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6  0  0  0  3  2   9  4.43  519/1384  4.19  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  0  0  2  2  10  4.57  548/1378  4.18  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6  0  1  0  3  1   9  4.21  888/1378  4.17  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   8  1  0  1  1   3  3.83  594/ 904  3.61  3.64  4.03  3.94  3.83

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  17  0  0  0  0  1   2  4.67 ****/ 239  4.00  4.67  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  17  1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          17   1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  17  1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18  4.47  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    6      0.00-0.99    0      A   7      Required for Majors  4      Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55    1      1.00-1.99    1      B   4                                 Under-grad   20     Non-major   20
56-83    1      2.00-2.99    1      C   3      General              2
84-150   1      3.00-3.49    1      D   1                                 #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.    0      3.50-4.00    4      F   0      Electives            2             responses to be significant
                                     P   0
                                     I   0      Other              6
                                     ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0201              University of Maryland                                 Page 1022
Title      ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC           Baltimore County                                      AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   RILEY, SAMANTHA               Spring 2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   64
Questionnaires: 38                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	3	28	4.59	567/1670	4.25	4.22	4.31	4.23	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	33	4.89	190/1666	4.52	4.27	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	36	4.97	58/1406	4.66	4.33	4.32	4.31	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	210/1615	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	21	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	715/1566	4.10	3.76	4.07	4.03	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	462/1528	3.88	4.14	4.12	4.00	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	3	31	4.81	229/1650	4.54	4.29	4.22	4.28	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	19	17	4.47	1186/1667	4.75	4.81	4.67	4.61	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	379/1626	4.19	3.99	4.11	4.07	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	371/1559	4.76	4.53	4.46	4.47	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	417/1560	4.80	4.69	4.72	4.68	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	294/1549	4.43	4.14	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	231/1546	4.59	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	20	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	****/1323	3.72	3.71	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	403/1384	4.19	3.49	4.10	3.92	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	927/1378	4.18	3.59	4.29	4.09	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	768/1378	4.17	3.61	4.31	4.08	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	429/ 904	3.61	3.64	4.03	3.94	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 239	4.00	4.67	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Title   ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 64
Questionnaires: 38   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	37
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 106  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1023
Title       ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC        Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    MARFANI, ERUM F            Spring 2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      58
Questionnaires:  29                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  2  8 11  7  3.72 1458/1670  4.25  4.22  4.31  4.23  3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  3 10 14  4.24  979/1666  4.52  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  3  7 17  4.31  823/1406  4.66  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   9  0  3  7  3  6  3.63 1399/1615  4.28  4.15  4.24  4.17  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 10  0  3  1 12  1  3.65 1210/1566  4.10  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 15 2 1 3 5 1  3.17 1423/1528  3.88  4.14  4.12  4.00  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  2  3  8 15  4.29  867/1650  4.54  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  3 25  4.89  693/1667  4.75  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 2 1 0 2 12 3  3.89 1143/1626  4.19  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.89


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  3  4 20  4.54  858/1559  4.76  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  1  0  2  3 21  4.59 1171/1560  4.80  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  1  4  9 13  4.14 1070/1549  4.43  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  1  6  5 14  4.11 1095/1546  4.59  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 16 1 0 5 3 3  3.58 1000/1323  3.72  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.58


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  3  1  5  6  7  3.59 1061/1384  4.19  3.49  4.10  3.92  3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1  0  8  4  8  3.86 1074/1378  4.18  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 1 0 7 5 8  3.90 1055/1378  4.17  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  14  2  1  3  0  2  2.88  847/ 904  3.61  3.64  4.03  3.94  2.88


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15  7  0  1  4  1  1  3.29 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 4 5 4  4.00  147/ 239  4.00  4.67  4.21  4.35  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 6 0 2 1 1 2  3.50 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18  5  0  2  1  1  2  3.50 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  6  0  2  1  1  1  3.20 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18  4.47  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 3 1 0 1 1 0  2.67 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 3 0 2 0 1 1  3.25 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 3 1 2 0 1 0  2.25 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    22  2  0  2  0  1  2  3.60 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                22  2  0  2  1  1  1  3.20 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97  3.99  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 1 2 1 1  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 2 0 4  4.33 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24  0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24  0  0  1  1  0  3  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24  0  0  1  1  0  3  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 2 1 2  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24  0  0  2  0  0  3  3.80 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24  0  0  2  0  0  3  3.80 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24  1  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     24  1  0  2  0  0  2  3.50 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 29   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   3   0.00-0.99   0   A   6   Required for Majors 14   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   3   1.00-1.99   3   B   4
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   1   C   11   General   1   Under-grad   29   Non-major   29
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   1   D   1
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   7
                                           ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 106Y 0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1024
Title       ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC        Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL             Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    9
Questionnaires:  2                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  1  1  0 3.50 1537/1670 3.50 4.22 4.31 4.23 3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 1199/1666 4.00 4.27 4.27 4.30 4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  597/1406 4.50 4.33 4.32 4.31 4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1615 5.00 4.15 4.24 4.17 5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 1566/1566 1.00 3.76 4.07 4.03 1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  1  0 4.00  899/1528 4.00 4.14 4.12 4.00 4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 1135/1650 4.00 4.29 4.22 4.28 4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1667 5.00 4.81 4.67 4.61 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00  953/1626 4.00 3.99 4.11 4.07 4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  896/1559 4.50 4.53 4.46 4.47 4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1560 5.00 4.69 4.72 4.68 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 1146/1549 4.00 4.14 4.31 4.32 4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 1139/1546 4.00 4.33 4.32 4.32 4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1323 5.00 3.71 4.00 3.91 5.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  0  1  0 2.50 1333/1384 2.50 3.49 4.10 3.92 2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  1  0  0  1  0 2.50 1348/1378 2.50 3.59 4.29 4.09 2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  1  0  1  0 3.00 1304/1378 3.00 3.61 4.31 4.08 3.00


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   0  1  0  0  0  1  0 4.00  147/ 232 4.00 4.00 4.19 4.25 4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 239 5.00 4.67 4.21 4.35 5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 230 5.00 5.00 4.44 4.58 5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            1  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 231 5.00 5.00 4.31 4.45 5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/ 218 5.00 5.00 4.18 4.47 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  1     Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0       B   0
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99   0       C   0        General              0     Under-grad   2      Non-major   2
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49   0       D   0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   1       F   0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                1
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 115  0101                    University of Maryland                                Page 1025
Title        FINITE MATHEMATICS                      Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  KOGAN, JACOB                             Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires:  15                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  5  2  6  1  1  2.40 1658/1670  2.40  4.22  4.31 4.23  2.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  3  6  2  2  2  2.60 1641/1666  2.60  4.27  4.27 4.30  2.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1  3  5  1  3  2  2.71 1391/1406  2.71  4.33  4.32 4.31  2.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  3  2  3  0  1  2.33 1606/1615  2.33  4.15  4.24 4.17  2.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  3  1  1  2  1  2.63 1535/1566  2.63  3.76  4.07 4.03  2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 0  2  0  1  2  3.60 1233/1528  3.60  4.14  4.12 4.00  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  4  5  1  2  3  2.67 1615/1650  2.67  4.29  4.22 4.28  2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 3  2  6  1  0  2.42 1601/1626  2.42  3.99  4.11 4.07  2.42


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  1  4  2  2  3  3.17 1509/1559  3.17  4.53  4.46 4.47  3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  2  2  5  3  3.75 1504/1560  3.75  4.69  4.72 4.68  3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  5  2  1  3  1  2.42 1527/1549  2.42  4.14  4.31 4.32  2.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  3  3  1  3  2  2.83 1503/1546  2.83  4.33  4.32 4.32  2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 6 0  2  0  1  1  3.25 1125/1323  3.25  3.71  4.00 3.91  3.25


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  1  0  2  2  3.50 1103/1384  3.50  3.49  4.10 3.92  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  1  1  0  1  3  3.67 1139/1378  3.67  3.59  4.29 4.09  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0  2  0  3  1  3.50 1189/1378  3.50  3.61  4.31 4.08  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   4  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03 3.94  ****


             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21 4.35  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.42  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 4.59  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 4.46  ****
```

                                 Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3       0.00-0.99    0      A    1       Required for Majors  9     Graduate      0     Major       0
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    3
  56-83      1       2.00-2.99    1      C    6       General              0     Under-grad   15     Non-major  15
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49    2      D    1
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    1      F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                1
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 132  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1026
Title        MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II          Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   TIGHE, BONNY                    Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   20
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  1  1  3  11  4.50  665/1670  4.50  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81  250/1666  4.81  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  0  16  5.00    1/1406  5.00  4.33  4.32  4.31  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   7  0  0  1  1   7  4.67  379/1615  4.67  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   3  0  1  1  5   6  4.23  664/1566  4.23  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8  0  0  1  1   6  4.63  330/1528  4.63  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94  111/1650  4.94  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  6  10  4.63 1062/1667  4.63  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  2  0  2  5   5  3.79 1233/1626  3.79  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.79


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  0  1  3   9  4.62  755/1559  4.62  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  0  0  3  10  4.77  929/1560  4.77  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  0  2  2   9  4.54  646/1549  4.54  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  1  1  0  0  11  4.46  768/1546  4.46  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  7  1  0  1  1   2  3.60  990/1323  3.60  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.60


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  1  1  1  1   4  3.75  996/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  0  0  2  0   6  4.50  603/1378  4.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  1  1  1  2   3  3.63 1159/1378  3.63  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   2  0  1  0  0   5  4.50  243/ 904  4.50  3.64  4.03  3.94  4.50

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99    0      A    5      Required for Majors   0    Graduate     2      Major        0
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0      B    9
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    2      C    0      General               1    Under-grad  15      Non-major   17
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
 Grad.      2      3.50-4.00    1      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                14
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0101                 University of Maryland                        Page 1027
Title          PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC          Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    BARADWAJ, RAJAL                 Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires: 13                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   0   2   3   7  4.15 1105/1670  3.92  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   6   7  4.54  582/1666   4.08  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   1  11  4.69  387/1406   4.12  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   8   0   1   0   2   2  4.00 1083/1615  3.95  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5   0   0   1   5   2  4.13  771/1566   3.37  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  0   1   1   1   0  3.00 ****/1528  3.37  4.14  4.12  4.00  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   1   3   8  4.38  744/1650   3.81  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0  10   3  4.23 1381/1667  4.84  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44  499/1626   3.57  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.44

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  521/1559   4.58  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00    1/1560   4.66  4.69  4.72  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   3   2   7  4.33  900/1549   4.03  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  407/1546   4.15  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  7   0   0   1   1   2  4.25  545/1323   3.70  3.71  4.00  3.91  4.25

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   7   2   2   1   1  2.00 1362/1384  2.48  3.49  4.10  3.92  2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   5   1   2   1   4  2.85 1330/1378  2.60  3.59  4.29  4.09  2.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   5   3   2   1   1  2.17 1358/1378  2.62  3.61  4.31  4.08  2.17
4. Were special techniques successful                   0  12   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.35  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1082/1670	3.92	4.22	4.31	4.23	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	767/1666	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.30	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	632/1406	4.12	4.33	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1009/1615	3.95	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1263/1566	3.37	3.76	4.07	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.37	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	1107/1650	3.81	4.29	4.22	4.28	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	405/1667	4.84	4.81	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1254/1626	3.57	3.99	4.11	4.07	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	706/1559	4.58	4.53	4.46	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	929/1560	4.66	4.69	4.72	4.68	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1275/1549	4.03	4.14	4.31	4.32	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	1048/1546	4.15	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1323	3.70	3.71	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	749/1384	2.48	3.49	4.10	3.92	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	970/1378	2.60	3.59	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	977/1378	2.62	3.61	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 904	****	3.64	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.19	4.25	****

```
                                      Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0104              University of Maryland                        Page 1029
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC             Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL                 Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires:  10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   1  0  0  4  3  4.00 1216/1670  3.92  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   1  0  0  4  3  4.00 1199/1666  4.08  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   0  1  1  2  4  4.13  980/1406  4.12  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   2   0  2  1  0  3  3.67 1380/1615  3.95  4.15  4.24  4.17  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   2   0  1  1  2  2  3.83 1078/1566  3.37  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  3  1  0  1  1  2  3.60 1233/1528  3.37  4.14  4.12  4.00  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   1  1  1  3  2  3.50 1460/1650  3.81  4.29  4.22  4.28  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0  0  0  1  7  4.88  730/1667  4.84  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  1  1  1  3  0  3.00 1534/1626  3.57  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0  0  0  2  6  4.75  521/1559  4.58  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0  0  0  1  7  4.88  673/1560  4.66  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   1  0  1  3  3  3.88 1251/1549  4.03  4.14  4.31  4.32  3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1  0  0  3  4  4.13 1087/1546  4.15  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  5  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1323  3.70  3.71  4.00  3.91  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   6  1  0  0  1  1.63 1376/1384  2.48  3.49  4.10  3.92  1.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   2  0  2  3  1  3.13 1289/1378  2.60  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  3  0  0  4  1  3.00 1304/1378  2.62  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.00


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.58  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  9   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  9   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        9   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****


            Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        9   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      9   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0201          University of Maryland                          Page 1030
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC        Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KAPOOR, JAGMOHA            Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    42
Questionnaires: 18               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions           NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  0  3 10  3 3.67 1486/1670 3.92 4.22 4.31 4.23 3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  2  2  5  8 3.94 1270/1666 4.08 4.27 4.27 4.30 3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  3  3  3  8 3.78 1198/1406 4.12 4.33 4.32 4.31 3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  13  0  0  2  1  2 4.00 1083/1615 3.95 4.15 4.24 4.17 4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  1  2  6  2  3 3.29 1393/1566 3.37 3.76 4.07 4.03 3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14  0  1  1  0  2 3.75 ****/1528 3.37 4.14 4.12 4.00 ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  1  2  4  9 3.94 1220/1650 3.81 4.29 4.22 4.28 3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1 16 4.94  405/1667 4.84 4.81 4.67 4.61 4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  2  2  3  5  2 3.21 1505/1626 3.57 3.99 4.11 4.07 3.21


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  4  3 11 4.39 1042/1559 4.58 4.53 4.46 4.47 4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  3  3 12 4.50 1248/1560 4.66 4.69 4.72 4.68 4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  2  3  5  7 3.83 1270/1549 4.03 4.14 4.31 4.32 3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  2  1  2  4  9 3.94 1194/1546 4.15 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10  1  2  0  1  4 3.63  980/1323 3.70 3.71 4.00 3.91 3.63


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  8  2  2  2  1 2.07 1360/1384 2.48 3.49 4.10 3.92 2.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  6  1  2  1  5 2.87 1328/1378 2.60 3.59 4.29 4.09 2.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  3  3  4  2  2 2.79 1330/1378 2.62 3.61 4.31 4.08 2.79
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  13  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.64 4.03 3.94 ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15   2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.00 4.19 4.25 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 239 **** 4.67 4.21 4.35 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 230 **** 5.00 4.44 4.58 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          17   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 231 **** 5.00 4.31 4.45 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 218 **** 5.00 4.18 4.47 ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  87 **** 5.00 4.65 4.67 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  79 **** **** 4.64 4.72 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  75 **** **** 4.57 4.46 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  79 **** 5.00 4.45 4.59 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  80 **** 3.00 3.97 3.99 ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  38 **** **** 4.19 4.07 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  38 **** **** 4.62 4.63 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  39 **** **** 4.27 4.42 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  31 **** **** 4.47 4.28 ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  28 **** **** 4.64 4.59 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  16 **** **** 4.67 4.83 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  27 **** **** 4.54 4.46 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  10 **** **** 4.84 4.75 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/   6 **** **** 4.92 4.83 ****
```

Title   PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 18   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   3   0.00-0.99   0   A   2   Required for Majors   4   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   2   1.00-1.99   1   B   2
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   0   C   9   General   0   Under-grad   18   Non-major   18
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   1   D   2
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   12
                                           ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0202              University of Maryland                              Page 1031
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC           Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KAPOOR, JAGMOHA               Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires: 33                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA   1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2  0   4  0  7 10  10  3.71 1470/1670  3.92  4.22  4.31 4.23  3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0   2  1  3  9  16  4.16 1070/1666  4.08  4.27  4.27 4.30  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  3  0   2  1  1  6  20  4.37  763/1406  4.12  4.33  4.32 4.31  4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2 18   1  0  2  4   6  4.08 1044/1615  3.95  4.15  4.24 4.17  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 14  3  0  5  3   6  3.53 1274/1566  3.37  3.76  4.07 4.03  3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 24 1 0 2 1  2  3.50 ****/1528  3.37  4.14  4.12 4.00  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  0   4  6  2  7  12  3.55 1448/1650  3.81  4.29  4.22 4.28  3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2  1   0  0  0  1  29  4.97  270/1667  4.84  4.81  4.67 4.61  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 1 0 4 9  5  3.89 1133/1626  3.57  3.99  4.11 4.07  3.89


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0   2  0  0  3  26  4.65  706/1559  4.58  4.53  4.46 4.47  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0   2  0  2  2  25  4.55 1214/1560  4.66  4.69  4.72 4.68  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  3  0  3  7  18  4.19 1027/1549  4.03  4.14  4.31 4.32  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0   2  0  2  7  20  4.39  869/1546  4.15  4.33  4.32 4.32  4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 18 1 0 5 2  5  3.77  912/1323  3.70  3.71  4.00 3.91  3.77


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0  8  3  6  2   5  2.71 1321/1384  2.48  3.49  4.10 3.92  2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0  9  6  3  2   4  2.42 1353/1378  2.60  3.59  4.29 4.09  2.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 9 1 6 0  6  2.68 1338/1378  2.62  3.61  4.31 4.08  2.68
4. Were special techniques successful                11 20   0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03 3.94  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 25 5   1  0  0  0   2  3.67 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 3 0 0 1  1  2.40 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 4 0 0 0 0  2  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         27  4   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 27 5  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18 4.47  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 30 2 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 30 2 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 30 2 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  31  0   0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              31  0   0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97 3.99  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30 0 0 1 0 1  1  3.67 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation     31  0   0  1  0  0   1  3.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 31  1   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31 1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.28  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 1 0 0 0  1  3.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  31  0   0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful    31  0   1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful     31  0   1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students   31  0   1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0203            University of Maryland                          Page 1032
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC          Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KAPOOR, JAGMOHA              Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   40
Questionnaires:  5               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   1  1  2  0  1  2.80 1640/1670  3.92 4.22  4.31 4.23  2.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   2  1  1  0  1  2.40 1650/1666  4.08 4.27  4.27 4.30  2.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   2  0  1  1  1  2.80 1384/1406  4.12 4.33  4.32 4.31  2.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   1  1  1  0  1  2.75 1598/1615  3.95 4.15  4.24 4.17  2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1  2  0  0  1  2.50 1537/1566  3.37 3.76  4.07 4.03  2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/1528  3.37 4.14  4.12 4.00  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   2  0  2  0  1  2.60 1620/1650  3.81 4.29  4.22 4.28  2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80  861/1667  4.84 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1  0  2  0  1  3.00 1534/1626  3.57 3.99  4.11 4.07  3.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  1  2  2  4.20 1199/1559  4.58 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  1  1  3  4.40 1326/1560  4.66 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  1  2  1  1  3.40 1431/1549  4.03 4.14  4.31 4.32  3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1  0  3  0  1  3.00 1473/1546  4.15 4.33  4.32 4.32  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 1295/1323  3.70 3.71  4.00 3.91  2.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  3  0  1  0  0  1.50 1378/1384  2.48 3.49  4.10 3.92  1.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  2  0  1  1  0  2.25 1363/1378  2.60 3.59  4.29 4.09  2.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  2  1  1  0  0  1.75 1374/1378  2.62 3.61  4.31 4.08  1.75


                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 239  **** 4.67  4.21 4.35  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0204              University of Maryland                        Page 1033
Title     PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC                Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                    Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   41
Questionnaires:  11                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  2  2  5  3.82 1407/1670  3.92  4.22  4.31  4.23  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  4  1  6  4.18 1048/1666  4.08  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  3  2  4  3.73 1218/1406  4.12  4.33  4.32  4.31  3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 1083/1615  3.95  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5  1  0  3  1  1  3.17 1440/1566  3.37  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 1274/1528  3.37  4.14  4.12  4.00  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  5  3  3.91 1278/1650  3.81  4.29  4.22  4.28  3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1667  4.84  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1  0  4  2  1  3.25 1491/1626  3.57  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.25


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  3  2  6  4.27 1143/1559  4.58  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  3  2  5  4.20 1427/1560  4.66  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  1  3  0  6  3.82 1280/1549  4.03  4.14  4.31  4.32  3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  2  3  1  5  3.82 1268/1546  4.15  4.33  4.32  4.32  3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2  1  0  3  0  3  3.57 1005/1323  3.70  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.57


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  4  2  2  0  0  1.75 1374/1384  2.48  3.49  4.10  3.92  1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  4  0  1  1  1  2.29 1361/1378  2.60  3.59  4.29  4.09  2.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  2  1  3  0  1  2.57 1347/1378  2.62  3.61  4.31  4.08  2.57
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****

                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 150  0205            University of Maryland                           Page 1034
Title      PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC              Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                    Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires:   2                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1670  3.92 4.22 4.31 4.23 5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1666  4.08 4.27 4.27 4.30 5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1406  4.12 4.33 4.32 4.31 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1615  3.95 4.15 4.24 4.17 5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1478/1566  3.37 3.76 4.07 4.03 3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  570/1650  3.81 4.29 4.22 4.28 4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1667  4.84 4.81 4.67 4.61 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  2  0  4.00  953/1626  3.57 3.99 4.11 4.07 4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1559  4.58 4.53 4.46 4.47 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1560  4.66 4.69 4.72 4.68 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1549  4.03 4.14 4.31 4.32 5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1546  4.15 4.33 4.32 4.32 5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1323  3.70 3.71 4.00 3.91 5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  820/1384  2.48 3.49 4.10 3.92 4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1373/1378  2.60 3.59 4.29 4.09 1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1363/1378  2.62 3.61 4.31 4.08 2.00


                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1035
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                   Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   29
Questionnaires: 12                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2  1  3  6  4.08 1172/1670  4.12 4.22  4.31 4.23  4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0  0  4  8  4.67  415/1666  4.35 4.27  4.27 4.30  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0  1  4  7  4.50  597/1406  4.19 4.33  4.32 4.31  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   1  0  3  4  4.25  874/1615  4.09 4.15  4.24 4.17  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   1   0  1  3  4  4.00  851/1566  3.71 3.76  4.07 4.03  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0   1  0  2  2  4.00  899/1528  3.95 4.14  4.12 4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1  1  1  9  4.50  570/1650  4.44 4.29  4.22 4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0  0  4  8  4.67 1022/1667  4.68 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  728/1626  4.16 3.99  4.11 4.07  4.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0  0  3  9  4.75  521/1559  4.66 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0  1  2  9  4.67 1090/1560  4.75 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0  1  2  9  4.67  488/1549  4.31 4.14  4.31 4.32  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0  1  3  8  4.58  619/1546  4.56 4.33  4.32 4.32  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8  0   1  0  1  2  4.00  692/1323  3.78 3.71  4.00 3.91  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  3   0  2  1  3  3.11 1251/1384  3.75 3.49  4.10 3.92  3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  3   3  0  1  2  2.56 1344/1378  3.50 3.59  4.29 4.09  2.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 2   1  1  2  3  3.33 1255/1378  3.73 3.61  4.31 4.08  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   7   0   0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 904  3.65 3.64  4.03 3.94  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11   0   0   0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 232  **** 4.00  4.19 4.25  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0102              University of Maryland                       Page 1036
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I            Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                     Spring 2008                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   31
Questionnaires:  11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   9   1  4.00 1216/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   8   2  4.09 1142/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   3   6  4.27  860/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6   0   0   1   1   3  4.40  687/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   0   0   1   3   2  4.17  734/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12  4.00  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55  513/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   6   4  4.40 1256/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   0   1   7   3  4.18  808/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.18


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80  435/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  596/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   4   6  4.45  749/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1   0   0   1   4   5  4.40  849/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 9 0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00  3.91  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   1   0   0   2   6  4.33  608/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   1   1   1   4   2  3.56 1174/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  1   0   2   4   1  3.50 1189/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   7   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1037
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI              Spring 2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires:  19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   1   1   4   3   9  4.00 1216/1670  4.12 4.22  4.31 4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2   9   7  4.28  943/1666  4.35 4.27  4.27 4.30  4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   1   5   3   8  3.89 1142/1406  4.19 4.33  4.32 4.31  3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   8   0   0   2   5   3  4.10 1028/1615  4.09 4.15  4.24 4.17  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  7   1   1   3   4   2  3.45 1316/1566  3.71 3.76  4.07 4.03  3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12  1   0   1   2   2  3.67 1202/1528  3.95 4.14  4.12 4.00  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   2   2  13  4.50  570/1650  4.44 4.29  4.22 4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   1   0   7  10  4.44 1216/1667  4.68 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0   0   1   9   3  4.15  843/1626  4.16 3.99  4.11 4.07  4.15


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   6  10  4.53  871/1559  4.66 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   2   1  14  4.71 1042/1560  4.75 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   2   9   5  4.19 1036/1549  4.31 4.14  4.31 4.32  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1   0   0   1   3  12  4.69  495/1546  4.56 4.33  4.32 4.32  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 11  0   0   1   4   1  4.00  692/1323  3.78 3.71  4.00 3.91  4.00


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   2   1   3   6   4  3.56 1075/1384  3.75 3.49  4.10 3.92  3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   1   5   5   4   1  2.94 1316/1378  3.50 3.59  4.29 4.09  2.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0   2   3   3   4   4  3.31 1262/1378  3.73 3.61  4.31 4.08  3.31
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  15   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 904  3.65 3.64  4.03 3.94  ****


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15  1   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/ 232  **** 4.00  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0  1   0   3   0   0  2.50 ****/ 239  **** 4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 2  0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/ 230  **** 5.00  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           15  1   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/ 231  **** 5.00  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  2   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 218  **** 5.00  4.18 4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 2  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 2  0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  79  **** ****  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 2  0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  75  **** ****  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15  2   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  79  **** 5.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15  2   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  80  **** 3.00  3.97 3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0   1   0   3   0   0  2.50 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0   2   0   1   1   0  2.25 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       15  2   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15  2   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15  2   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0  3   0   0   0   1  2.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15  3   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15  3   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15  3   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2  0   0   0   1  11   5  4.24 1017/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31 4.23  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0   0   0   3   6   8  4.29  919/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27 4.30  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  0   1   1   4   3   8  3.94 1101/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32 4.31  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2  7   0   1   1   3   5  4.20  944/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24 4.17  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 7  0   0   2   6   2  4.00  851/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07 4.03  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 11 0  0   2   2   2  4.00  899/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12 4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  0   1   0   1   5  10  4.35  782/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22 4.28  4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2  0   0   0   0   6  11  4.65 1042/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67 4.61  4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0   0   1   5   5  4.36  605/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11 4.07  4.36


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3  0   0   0   1   1  14  4.81  419/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46 4.47  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3  0   0   0   1   2  13  4.75  948/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72 4.68  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0   2   1   3  10  4.31  924/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31 4.32  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0   1   0   1   4  10  4.38  879/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32 4.32  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 11 1  0   1   1   1  3.25 ****/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00 3.91  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  1   1   3   3   4  3.67 1033/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10 3.92  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  1   2   2   3   4  3.58 1163/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29 4.09  3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 1   0   2   4   4  3.91 1055/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31 4.08  3.91
4. Were special techniques successful                 7 10   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03 3.94  ****

                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0301                   University of Maryland                                    Page 1039
Title         CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I             Baltimore County                                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   TIGHE, BONNY                       Spring 2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 15                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1  5   9  4.53  632/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  3  11  4.67  415/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  1  4  10  4.60  495/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   5  0  0  1  4   5  4.40  687/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  2  3  4   3  3.67 1200/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0  0  1  4   5  4.40  560/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  6   8  4.47  630/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  15  5.00    1/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0  1  3   9  4.62  316/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.62


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  4  11  4.73  555/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  1  14  4.93  417/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0  0  0  4  11  4.73  395/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  3  12  4.80  345/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 0 1  2  0   3  3.83  871/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.83


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  0  3  2   9  4.20  712/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0  0  4  3   8  4.27  854/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1  2  4   8  4.27  861/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   3  2  0  0  6   4  3.83  594/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03  3.94  3.83


                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99    1       A    6        Required for Majors   0        Graduate      0        Major         0
 28-55      4      1.00-1.99    0       B    4
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    0       C    3        General               0        Under-grad   15        Non-major    15
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49    1       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0        Electives             1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                11
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0302              University of Maryland                              Page 1040
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   TIGHE, BONNY                    Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   29
Questionnaires: 23                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  4  8 10  4.27   974/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  3  3 16  4.59   503/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  2 18  4.73   352/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  6  0  1  3  2 10  4.31   800/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  1  0  3  6  7  4.06   820/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 11  0  2  3  3  3  3.64  1217/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12  4.00  3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  7 14  4.59   443/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1 21  4.95   338/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9  0  0  0  2  4  8  4.43   531/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.43


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  2  1 19  4.77   486/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  1  0  3 18  4.73  1004/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  2  5 14  4.45   749/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  1  1  2 18  4.68   495/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 14  1  1  2  2  2  3.38  1089/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.38


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  1  7  9  4.33   608/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  1  3  7  6  4.06   951/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41   741/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.41
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  7  2  0  2  2  4  3.60   698/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03  3.94  3.60


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          21  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.45  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****


                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      6        0.00-0.99    0      A    8       Required for Majors   2      Graduate      0      Major       0
28-55      2        1.00-1.99    0      B    6
56-83      0        2.00-2.99    2      C    5       General               0      Under-grad   23      Non-major  23
84-150     1        3.00-3.49    0      D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    7      F    0       Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                16
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0401          University of Maryland                        Page 1041
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                  Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires:  13                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  0  3  2  6  4.00 1216/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31 4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4  0  8  4.33  870/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27 4.30  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  1  3  7  4.33  799/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32 4.31  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   3  0  1  2  2  3  3.88 1252/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24 4.17  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  4  1  0  0  2  4  4.14  752/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07 4.03  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 6 0 0 0 0 5 5.00    1/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12 4.00  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  298/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22 4.28  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 5 4  4.18  808/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11 4.07  4.18


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  0  0  2 10  4.54  858/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46 4.47  4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  0  0  2 10  4.54 1222/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72 4.68  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  1  3  8  4.31  936/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31 4.32  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  0  1 10  4.67  520/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32 4.32  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9 1 0 0 0 3  4.00  692/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00 3.91  4.00


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  0  1  4  6  3.92  909/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10 3.92  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  2  2  5  3  1  2.92 1319/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29 4.09  2.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 3 0 3 1 6  3.54 1181/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31 4.08  3.54
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  11  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03 3.94  ****


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18 4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97 3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 13   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   2   0.00-0.99   0   A   1   Required for Majors 2   Graduate   0   Major   2
28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   6
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   2   C   3   General   0   Under-grad 13   Non-major   11
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   2   D   1
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   0   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   9
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0402            University of Maryland                              Page 1042
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                    Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires:  25              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  2  5  9  8  3.96 1280/1670  4.12 4.22  4.31 4.23  3.96
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  2  4  8 10  3.96 1246/1666  4.35 4.27  4.27 4.30  3.96
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  1  5  5  7  6  3.50 1275/1406  4.19 4.33  4.32 4.31  3.50
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   7  1  2  2 10  3  3.67 1380/1615  4.09 4.15  4.24 4.17  3.67
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  11  2  2  3  4  3  3.29 1393/1566  3.71 3.76  4.07 4.03  3.29
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15 1  3  2  2  2  3.10 1440/1528  3.95 4.14  4.12 4.00  3.10
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  2  4  7 11  4.00 1135/1650  4.44 4.29  4.22 4.28  4.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  2  1 22  4.80  861/1667  4.68 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.80
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 1  0  3  7  4  3.87 1162/1626  4.16 3.99  4.11 4.07  3.87


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  2  4 18  4.67  673/1559  4.66 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.67
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  948/1560  4.75 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.75
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  1  4  4 14  4.35  888/1549  4.31 4.14  4.31 4.32  4.35
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  3  2  4 14  4.26  979/1546  4.56 4.33  4.32 4.32  4.26
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 13 0  1  0  5  1  3.86  857/1323  3.78 3.71  4.00 3.91  3.86


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1 10  5  9  3.88  940/1384  3.75 3.49  4.10 3.92  3.88
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  5 10  5  5  3.40 1228/1378  3.50 3.59  4.29 4.09  3.40
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  1  2 10  5  7  3.60 1165/1378  3.73 3.61  4.31 4.08  3.60
 4. Were special techniques successful                   0  19  0  1  2  2  1  3.50 ****/ 904  3.65 3.64  4.03 3.94  ****


            Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   0  0  1  1  1  0  3.00 ****/ 232  **** 4.00  4.19 4.25  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 239  **** 4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 1 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 230  **** 5.00  4.44 4.58  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23   0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 231  **** 5.00  4.31 4.45  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 218  **** 5.00  4.18 4.47  ****


            Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  79  **** ****  4.64 4.72  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  75  **** ****  4.57 4.46  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    24   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 5.00  4.45 4.59  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                24   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  **** 3.00  3.97 3.99  ****


            Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


            Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       24   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     24   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	3						

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0501            University of Maryland                            Page 1043
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   TIGHE, BONNY                    Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 27              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  3  7 16  4.50  665/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  4 20  4.69  378/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  2  4 19  4.58  525/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  11  0  1  3  1 10  4.33  775/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   8  3  2  4  4  5  3.33 1373/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 16  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  662/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  3  6 17  4.54  527/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0 26  5.00    1/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  0  0  1  6 13  4.60  324/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.60


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  3 22  4.88  307/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  1 24  4.96  239/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  1  1  2 21  4.72  424/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  1  0  4 20  4.72  457/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 20  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00  3.91  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  1  6  7  4  2  3.00 1260/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  1  2  5  8  4  3.60 1156/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  1  0  2  6 11  4.30  840/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.30
4. Were special techniques successful                   7  13  1  1  3  1  1  3.00  820/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03  3.94  3.00


                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0502              University of Maryland                              Page 1044
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                    Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 12                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58   578/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50   622/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83   240/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  3  0  0  1  3  5  4.44   633/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  1  2  3  4  4.00   851/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 0 2  2  3  4.14   805/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64   395/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91   675/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 0  0  7  5.00     1/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11  4.07  5.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   435/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   596/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   451/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   482/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 1 0 2  2  2  3.57  1005/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.57


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  2  2  1  5  3.90   932/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  0  3  2  4  3.80  1092/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 4  2  4  4.00   977/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  7  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   179/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03  3.94  4.67


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0601            University of Maryland                         Page 1045
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I          Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI                  Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   29
Questionnaires:  9            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   1   5   2  3.78 1430/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31  4.23  3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   3   3  3.89 1331/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27  4.30  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67  423/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   1   3   1   2  3.57 1427/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.17  3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0   2   2   0   2  3.33 1373/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4   1   0   0   1   3  4.00  899/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   1   6  4.33  806/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   1   0   6   2  4.00 1524/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  1   1   0   3   4  3.89 1143/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.89


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67  673/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   2   2   5  4.33 1376/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   1   1   6  4.33  900/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67  520/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4   0   1   0   0   4  4.40  423/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00  3.91  4.40


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   2   0   1   1   5  3.78  987/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   2   2   0   5  3.89 1064/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   1   2   3   3  3.89 1061/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   7   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0602            University of Maryland                            Page 1046
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I         Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SLOWIKOWSKI, WI              Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires:  11                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions             NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   3   1   6  4.09 1167/1670  4.12  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   6   5  4.45  703/1666  4.35  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   6   4  4.18  932/1406  4.19  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  552/1615  4.09  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5   0   1   0   3   2  4.00  851/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  899/1528  3.95  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64  395/1650  4.44  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0  10   1  4.09 1477/1667  4.68  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0   1   3   2   3  3.78 1240/1626  4.16  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.78


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   4   6  4.45  959/1559  4.66  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64 1126/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   2   1   3   5  4.00 1146/1549  4.31  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   0   2   8  4.55  667/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  9   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/1323  3.78  3.71  4.00  3.91  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0   1   0   1   2   6  4.20  712/1384  3.75  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0   0   2   3   0   5  3.80 1092/1378  3.50  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   1   0   4   2   2  3.44 1213/1378  3.73  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.44
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   7   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 904  3.65  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0701            University of Maryland                              Page 1047
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I        Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C                Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 18                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  3  5  3  6  3.71 1470/1670  4.12 4.22  4.31 4.23  3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  1  2  7  7  4.18 1059/1666  4.35 4.27  4.27 4.30  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  3  1  5  5  3  3.24 1328/1406  4.19 4.33  4.32 4.31  3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   4  1  0  4  5  3  3.69 1362/1615  4.09 4.15  4.24 4.17  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   7  0  1  5  2  2  3.50 1285/1566  3.71 3.76  4.07 4.03  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10  0  1  4  0  1  3.17 1423/1528  3.95 4.14  4.12 4.00  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  1  1  3  4  7  3.94 1235/1650  4.44 4.29  4.22 4.28  3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  1  0  4 12  4.59 1097/1667  4.68 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  1  1  5  4  1  3.25 1491/1626  4.16 3.99  4.11 4.07  3.25


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  1  1  5  9  4.38 1052/1559  4.66 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63 1138/1560  4.75 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  1  2  2  8  3  3.63 1358/1549  4.31 4.14  4.31 4.32  3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  1  3  8  3  3.69 1321/1546  4.56 4.33  4.32 4.32  3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  9  0  0  3  3  1  3.71  936/1323  3.78 3.71  4.00 3.91  3.71


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  2  2  4  7  2  3.29 1188/1384  3.75 3.49  4.10 3.92  3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  1  3  7  3  3  3.24 1269/1378  3.50 3.59  4.29 4.09  3.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  5  2  6  2  2  2.65 1342/1378  3.73 3.61  4.31 4.08  2.65
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  11  0  2  2  1  1  3.17  808/ 904  3.65 3.64  4.03 3.94  3.17


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     10      0.00-0.99    1      A    3      Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B    4
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    4      C    6      General               1     Under-grad  18      Non-major  18
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49    0      D    2
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                13
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 151  0702          University of Maryland                              Page 1048
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I       Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C              Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires:  3               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1216/1670  4.12 4.22  4.31 4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  870/1666  4.35 4.27  4.27 4.30  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 1314/1406  4.19 4.33  4.32 4.31  3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1448/1615  4.09 4.15  4.24 4.17  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  1  0  0  0  3.00 1478/1566  3.71 3.76  4.07 4.03  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  806/1650  4.44 4.29  4.22 4.28  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1667  4.68 4.81  4.67 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1312/1626  4.16 3.99  4.11 4.07  3.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  896/1559  4.66 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1560  4.75 4.69  4.72 4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1389/1549  4.31 4.14  4.31 4.32  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1546  4.56 4.33  4.32 4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1179/1323  3.78 3.71  4.00 3.91  3.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 1171/1384  3.75 3.49  4.10 3.92  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 1247/1378  3.50 3.59  4.29 4.09  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  977/1378  3.73 3.61  4.31 4.08  4.00


                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1049
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY             Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                   Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   40
Questionnaires:  29              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  0  0  1  6  21  4.71   414/1670  4.31 4.22  4.31 4.23  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  5  8  16  4.38   821/1666  4.24 4.27  4.27 4.30  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0  0  2  3  4  18  4.41   715/1406  4.10 4.33  4.32 4.31  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   3  13  0  1  2  2   8  4.31   813/1615  4.00 4.15  4.24 4.17  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  13  3  2  2  1   7  3.47  1310/1566  3.57 3.76  4.07 4.03  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  18  1  1  2  2   4  3.70  1182/1528  3.86 4.14  4.12 4.00  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  1  2  6  19  4.54   527/1650  4.30 4.29  4.22 4.28  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  0  4  23  4.85   768/1667  4.95 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  6  0  0  0  2 13   8  4.26   716/1626  4.00 3.99  4.11 4.07  4.26


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  1  5  21  4.74   538/1559  4.59 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  5  22  4.81   829/1560  4.75 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  0  2  6  5  14  4.15  1070/1549  4.06 4.14  4.31 4.32  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  4  6  17  4.48   741/1546  4.29 4.33  4.32 4.32  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  3  16  1  0  5  0   4  3.60   990/1323  3.48 3.71  4.00 3.91  3.60


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5  0  0  1  7  4  12  4.13   777/1384  3.83 3.49  4.10 3.92  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5  0  0  2  3  4  15  4.33   797/1378  4.08 3.59  4.29 4.09  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6  0  0  2  4  8   9  4.04   965/1378  3.99 3.61  4.31 4.08  4.04
4. Were special techniques successful                 5   3  2  1  3  4  11  4.00   461/ 904  3.61 3.64  4.03 3.94  4.00


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26  1  0  0  1  1   0  3.50  ****/ 232  **** 4.00  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  27  0  0  0  1  1   0  3.50  ****/ 239  **** 4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  27  1  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/ 230  **** 5.00  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          27   1  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/ 231  **** 5.00  4.31 4.45  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      8       0.00-0.99     0      A   15      Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0      Major       2
 28-55      8       1.00-1.99     0      B    7                                  Under-grad   29      Non-major  27
 56-83      4       2.00-2.99     0      C    3      General              0
 84-150     1       3.00-3.49     4      D    0                                  #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    10      F    0      Electives            0             responses to be significant
                                         P    0
                                         I    0      Other               25
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0102              University of Maryland                        Page 1050
Title      CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY            Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                  Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   36
Questionnaires: 21                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  3 16  4.67   479/1670  4.31  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3  4 13  4.50   622/1666  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  5 13  4.43   691/1406  4.10  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  12  0  0  2  2  5  4.33   775/1615  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  2  0  4  4  3  3.46  1310/1566  3.57  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  1  0  3  1  3  3.63  1222/1528  3.86  4.14  4.12  4.00  3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  4  5 12  4.38   744/1650  4.30  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4 17  4.81   861/1667  4.95  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  0  0  3  8  6  4.18   820/1626  4.00  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.18


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  1 19  4.86   355/1559  4.59  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2 19  4.90   596/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  2  8 11  4.43   789/1549  4.06  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  3 16  4.67   520/1546  4.29  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 12  3  1  2  0  3  2.89  1229/1323  3.48  3.71  4.00  3.91  2.89


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  6  3  7  4.06   805/1384  3.83  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  2  3  3  9  4.12   927/1378  4.08  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  5  4  8  4.18   910/1378  3.99  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   3  1  0  2  5  5  4.00   461/ 904  3.61  3.64  4.03  3.94  4.00


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4      0.00-0.99    0       A   10      Required for Majors   0    Graduate       0     Major        0
 28-55     8      1.00-1.99    0       B    6
 56-83     3      2.00-2.99    2       C    1      General               1    Under-grad    21     Non-major   21
 84-150    1      3.00-3.49    3       D    1
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   12       F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                17
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1051
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY         Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SONG, YOON J                  Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires:  20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   8  10  4.40  809/1670  4.31  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   3   5  10  4.15 1081/1666  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   2   2   6   9  4.00 1057/1406  4.10  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   1   0   3   3   8  4.13 1000/1615  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  7   0   1   3   3   5  4.00  851/1566  3.57  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10  1   0   1   2   5  4.11  832/1528  3.86  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   0   1   5  12  4.42  690/1650  4.30  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1667  4.95  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0   0   5   6   5  4.00  953/1626  4.00  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   1  16  4.83  387/1559  4.59  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   1   4  13  4.67 1090/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   1   0   4   4   9  4.11 1095/1549  4.06  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   1   2   4  11  4.39  869/1546  4.29  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6  1   2   2   3   4  3.58 1000/1323  3.48  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.58


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   1   0   0   6   9  4.38  570/1384  3.83  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   1   0   3   6   6  4.00  970/1378  4.08  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  2   1   5   3   5  3.50 1189/1378  3.99  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  14   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 904  3.61  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  18  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0  1  0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 1  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.45  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****


                         Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0202            University of Maryland                              Page 1052
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY          Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SONG, YOON J                    Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 21                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	643/1670	4.31	4.22	4.31	4.23	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	529/1666	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.30	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	632/1406	4.10	4.33	4.32	4.31	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	520/1615	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	3	3	1	5	3.67	1200/1566	3.57	3.76	4.07	4.03	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	260/1528	3.86	4.14	4.12	4.00	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	471/1650	4.30	4.29	4.22	4.28	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	338/1667	4.95	4.81	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	637/1626	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	276/1559	4.59	4.53	4.46	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	1163/1560	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.68	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	500/1549	4.06	4.14	4.31	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	345/1546	4.29	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	807/1323	3.48	3.71	4.00	3.91	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	476/1384	3.83	3.49	4.10	3.92	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	420/1378	4.08	3.59	4.29	4.09	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	1	9	4.07	959/1378	3.99	3.61	4.31	4.08	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	3.61	3.64	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.67	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Title   CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: SONG, YOON J   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 21   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   5   0.00-0.99   0   A   4   Required for Majors 0   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   7   1.00-1.99   1   B   8
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   2   C   7   General   2   Under-grad   21   Non-major   21
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   6   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   17
                                        ?   0

```
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires: 33                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	363/1670	4.31	4.22	4.31	4.23	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	28	4.79	280/1666	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	318/1406	4.10	4.33	4.32	4.31	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	412/1615	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	4	3	5	12	3.92	978/1566	3.57	3.76	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	413/1528	3.86	4.14	4.12	4.00	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	21	4.58	471/1650	4.30	4.29	4.22	4.28	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	270/1667	4.95	4.81	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	58/1626	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.07	4.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	371/1559	4.59	4.53	4.46	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	596/1560	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	323/1549	4.06	4.14	4.31	4.32	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	333/1546	4.29	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	273/1323	3.48	3.71	4.00	3.91	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	205/1384	3.83	3.49	4.10	3.92	4.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	379/1378	4.08	3.59	4.29	4.09	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	521/1378	3.99	3.61	4.31	4.08	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	2	16	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	405/ 904	3.61	3.64	4.03	3.94	4.20

```
                                       Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0302            University of Maryland                         Page 1054
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY          Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  TIGHE, BONNY                   Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires:  9                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  479/1670   4.31  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  190/1666   4.24  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  546/1406   4.10  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  552/1615   4.00  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  2  1  1  4  3.56 1257/1566   3.57  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  504/1528   3.86  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  361/1650   4.30  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1667   4.95  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00  953/1626   4.00  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  834/1559   4.59  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  911/1560   4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  900/1549   4.06  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  520/1546   4.29  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1323   3.48  3.71  4.00  3.91  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  758/1384   3.83  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  0  0  2  4  4.14  915/1378   4.08  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  850/1378   3.99  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.29
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3  1  1  0  1  1  3.00  820/ 904   3.61  3.64  4.03  3.94  3.00

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0401              University of Maryland                          Page 1055
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY               Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  WILSON, MARY C                       Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   26
Questionnaires: 26                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   1   4  11  10  4.15 1105/1670  4.31  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   2   6  10   8  3.92 1294/1666  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.30  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   2   3   5   7   9  3.69 1228/1406  4.10  4.33  4.32  4.31  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  10   0   0   2   7   7  4.31  800/1615  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  11   1   2   1   4   7  3.93  962/1566  3.57  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  16   1   1   2   2   4  3.70 1182/1528  3.86  4.14  4.12  4.00  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   2   3   9  12  4.19  973/1650  4.30  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0  26  5.00    1/1667  4.95  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4   1   3   2   4   9   3  3.33 1462/1626  4.00  3.99  4.11  4.07  3.33

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   2   5  19  4.65  689/1559  4.59  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   1   4  21  4.77  929/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   1   3   5   7  10  3.85 1265/1549  4.06  4.14  4.31  4.32  3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   3   6   4  12  3.88 1240/1546  4.29  4.33  4.32  4.32  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  18   1   1   2   1   2  3.29 1114/1323  3.48  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.29

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4   0   4   2   3   4   9  3.55 1084/1384  3.83  3.49  4.10  3.92  3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4   0   0   3   4   5  10  4.00  970/1378  4.08  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6   0   2   1   2   5  10  4.00  977/1378  3.99  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  17   1   0   0   1   2  3.75 ****/ 904  3.61  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     7       0.00-0.99    2        A    6       Required for Majors   1    Graduate    0        Major        2
 28-55     5       1.00-1.99    0        B    5                                  Under-grad  26
 56-83     3       2.00-2.99    3        C    7       General               1    Under-grad  26       Non-major   24
 84-150    1       3.00-3.49    4        D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5        F    1       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                21
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0402               University of Maryland                        Page 1056
Title       CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY             Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   WILSON, MARY C                  Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires:  8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  2  1  2  3  0  2.75 1644/1670  4.31  4.22  4.31  4.23  2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  3  1  3  0  1  2.38 1650/1666  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.30  2.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  2  4  1  0  1  2.25 1401/1406  4.10  4.33  4.32  4.31  2.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  5  2  1  0  0  0  1.33 1615/1615  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.17  1.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  2  1  2  0  0  2.00 1551/1566  3.57  3.76  4.07  4.03  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  1  2  1  0  0  2.00 1515/1528  3.86  4.14  4.12  4.00  2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  2  2  0  3  3.25 1541/1650  4.30  4.29  4.22  4.28  3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1667  4.95  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 2 1  3  0  1  2.57 1590/1626  4.00  3.99  4.11  4.07  2.57


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  3  0  0  4  3.38 1485/1559  4.59  4.53  4.46  4.47  3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38 1347/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  3  1  3  1  0  2.25 1532/1549  4.06  4.14  4.31  4.32  2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  3  1  1  1  2  2.75 1511/1546  4.29  4.33  4.32  4.32  2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 1  1  1  0  0  2.00 1295/1323  3.48  3.71  4.00  3.91  2.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  2  3  1  0  2.38 1350/1384  3.83  3.49  4.10  3.92  2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0  2  0  2  1  3  3.38 1236/1378  4.08  3.59  4.29  4.09  3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 1  1  2  0  4  3.63 1159/1378  3.99  3.61  4.31  4.08  3.63


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 152  0501            University of Maryland                           Page 1057
Title        CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY         Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  PITTENGER, ART                Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 21                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  1  1  4  2 13  4.19 1060/1670  4.31  4.22  4.31 4.23  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  2  5 14  4.57  529/1666  4.24  4.27  4.27 4.30  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  5  4 12  4.33  799/1406  4.10  4.33  4.32 4.31  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   6  0  1  4  5  5  3.93 1188/1615  4.00  4.15  4.24 4.17  3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   4  0  0  6  3  8  4.12  780/1566  3.57  3.76  4.07 4.03  4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 11  0  1  3  1  4  3.89 1055/1528  3.86  4.14  4.12 4.00  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  1  1  4  3 12  4.14 1032/1650  4.30  4.29  4.22 4.28  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                    1   0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  405/1667  4.95  4.81  4.67 4.61  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  1  0  0  2  5  7  4.36  616/1626  4.00  3.99  4.11 4.07  4.36


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          1   0  0  0  1  7 12  4.55  834/1559  4.59  4.53  4.46 4.47  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1   0  0  0  1  0 19  4.90  596/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72 4.68  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2   0  1  0  4  7  7  4.00 1146/1549  4.06  4.14  4.31 4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       2   0  1  0  3  6  9  4.16 1064/1546  4.29  4.33  4.32 4.32  4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   9  0  0  4  2  4  4.00  692/1323  3.48  3.71  4.00 3.91  4.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0  7  3  3  3  3  2.58 1328/1384  3.83  3.49  4.10 3.92  2.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0  4  2  4  3  6  3.26 1263/1378  4.08  3.59  4.29 4.09  3.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2   0  4  1  2  5  7  3.53 1184/1378  3.99  3.61  4.31 4.08  3.53
4. Were special techniques successful                    2  12  3  0  1  1  2  2.86  849/ 904  3.61  3.64  4.03 3.94  2.86


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   17   1  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            17   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  17   2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18 4.47  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18   1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     18   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 18   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97 3.99  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        18   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    18   0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18   0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.28  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18   0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        18   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1058
Title      ELEMENTARY CALCULUS             Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KELLY, BRIAN W                   Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    55
Questionnaires:  32                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies    Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  3  3 13 12  4.00 1216/1670  4.17  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  7  4 20  4.34  858/1666   4.39  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  0 13 17  4.41  715/1406   4.53  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  4  4  9  6  3.74 1337/1615  4.13  4.15  4.24  4.17  3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 13  2  0  3  8  5  3.78 1129/1566  3.81  3.76  4.07  4.03  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 9  3  1 10  7  4.00  899/1528   4.21  4.14  4.12  4.00  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  0  0  6  6 17  4.38  757/1650   4.40  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 31  5.00    1/1667   4.60  4.81  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0  3 11 10  4.29  681/1626   4.07  3.99  4.11  4.07  4.29

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  1  6 24  4.66  689/1559   4.60  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  3 28  4.84  751/1560   4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  7 22  4.59  574/1549   4.30  4.14  4.31  4.32  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  3  7 21  4.58  619/1546   4.60  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 19 2 0  2  3  3  3.50 1040/1323  3.96  3.71  4.00  3.91  3.50

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 1 2  5 11  4.20  712/1384   4.22  3.49  4.10  3.92  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 4  5 11  4.35  774/1378   4.33  3.59  4.29  4.09  4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 2 3 13  4.47  682/1378   4.25  3.61  4.31  4.08  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   7  1  1  4  3  3  3.50  718/ 904   3.50  3.64  4.03  3.94  3.50

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26   3  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0 1 0 0  3  4.25 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 2 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           29   1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18  4.47  ****

           Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    30   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                30   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97  3.99  ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****

           Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0101            University of Maryland                    Page 1058
Title          ELEMENTARY CALCULUS            Baltimore County                     AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    KELLY, BRIAN W                    Spring 2008                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    55
Questionnaires: 32                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0          A   6        Required for Majors  4      Graduate    0      Major        0
28-55     5        1.00-1.99   2          B   9
56-83     2        2.00-2.99   3          C   7        General              0      Under-grad  32     Non-major    32
84-150    2        3.00-3.49   4          D   3
Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   0          F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                23
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0201          University of Maryland                        Page 1059
Title      ELEMENTARY CALCULUS             Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL                Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    59
Questionnaires:  20              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  3  7 10  4.35   876/1670   4.17  4.22  4.31  4.23  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  7 11  4.45   719/1666   4.39  4.27  4.27  4.30  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  4 14  4.60   495/1406   4.53  4.33  4.32  4.31  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  9  0  0  2  1  8  4.55   509/1615   4.13  4.15  4.24  4.17  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  1  4  3  7  4.07   814/1566   3.81  3.76  4.07  4.03  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 3 6 7 4.25 706/1528 4.21 4.14 4.12 4.00 4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  8 10  4.40   720/1650   4.40  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 12  8  4.40  1256/1667   4.60  4.81  4.67  4.61  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 0 1 1 9 4 4.07 921/1626 4.07 3.99 4.11 4.07 4.07


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  2  5 11  4.50   896/1559   4.60  4.53  4.46  4.47  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  1  5 11  4.59  1180/1560   4.75  4.69  4.72  4.68  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 994/1549 4.30 4.14 4.31 4.32 4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  0  0  1  4 12  4.65   545/1546   4.60  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 9 0 0 2 0 5 4.43 403/1323 3.96 3.71 4.00 3.91 4.43


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 3 3 6 4.25 670/1384 4.22 3.49 4.10 3.92 4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 860/1378 4.33 3.59 4.29 4.09 4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 3 2 7 4.33 813/1378 4.25 3.61 4.31 4.08 4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  8  0  1  0  2  1  3.75  ****/ 904   3.50  3.64  4.03  3.94  ****

                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0      A    0      Required for Majors   2    Graduate     0      Major         0
  28-55      3      1.00-1.99    0      B    6
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    5      C    9      General               1    Under-grad  20      Non-major    20
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49    1      D    1
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                15
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 155  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1060
Title      ELEMENTARY CALCULUS               Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BARADWAJ, RAJAL                  Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    52
Questionnaires: 31                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   8  10  13  4.16 1094/1670  4.17 4.22  4.31 4.23  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3  13  15  4.39  808/1666  4.39 4.27  4.27 4.30  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   1  11  19  4.58  515/1406  4.53 4.33  4.32 4.31  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  10   1   2   1   7  10  4.10 1033/1615  4.13 4.15  4.24 4.17  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   2   3   4   6   7  3.59 1235/1566  3.81 3.76  4.07 4.03  3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 18  0   0   2   4   7  4.38  580/1528  4.21 4.14  4.12 4.00  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   2   2   8  19  4.42  705/1650  4.40 4.29  4.22 4.28  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   1   0  15  14  4.40 1256/1667  4.60 4.81  4.67 4.61  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1  1   0   6   7   6  3.85 1172/1626  4.07 3.99  4.11 4.07  3.85


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   1   1   6  23  4.65  706/1559  4.60 4.53  4.46 4.47  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   2   2  27  4.81  855/1560  4.75 4.69  4.72 4.68  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   2   8   7  14  4.06 1120/1549  4.30 4.14  4.31 4.32  4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   2   9  20  4.58  619/1546  4.60 4.33  4.32 4.32  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 23  0  0   2   1   4  4.29 ****/1323  3.96 3.71  4.00 3.91  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  1  0   3   2   9  4.20  712/1384  4.22 3.49  4.10 3.92  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  0  1   1   4   9  4.40  718/1378  4.33 3.59  4.29 4.09  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1  1   2   5   6  3.93 1031/1378  4.25 3.61  4.31 4.08  3.93
4. Were special techniques successful                 16   8   0   0   1   2   4  4.43 ****/ 904  3.50 3.64  4.03 3.94  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24   1   0   0   0   2   4  4.67 ****/ 232  **** 4.00  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 0  0   2   4  4.67 ****/ 239  **** 4.67  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 1 0  0   1   0   4  4.60 ****/ 230  **** 5.00  4.44 4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          25   0   0   1   0   1   4  4.33 ****/ 231  **** 5.00  4.31 4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25  1   0   0   0   2   3  4.60 ****/ 218  **** 5.00  4.18 4.47  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 0  0  0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 0 0  0   0   3  5.00 ****/  79  **** ****  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28 0  0  0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  75  **** ****  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   28   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  79  **** 5.00  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               28   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  80  **** 3.00  3.97 3.99  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      28   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  28   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0  0  0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   28   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     28   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      28   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    28   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 31   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   6   0.00-0.99   0   A   3   Required for Majors   2   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   14
56-83   6   2.00-2.99   5   C   9   General   0   Under-grad   31   Non-major   31
84-150   2   3.00-3.49   10   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   24
                                          ?   1

```
Course-Section: MATH 215  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1061
Title         FINITE MATH FOR INFO S        Baltimore County                                       AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KAPOOR, JAGMOHA               Spring 2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   55
Questionnaires: 24                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  0 10 13  4.42  794/1670  4.42  4.22  4.31  4.32  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  6 18  4.75  312/1666  4.75  4.27  4.27  4.27  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  318/1406  4.75  4.33  4.32  4.39  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  346/1615  4.69  4.15  4.24  4.29  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  8  0  0  2  5  8  4.40  491/1566  4.40  3.76  4.07  4.00  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8 0 0 2 4 9  4.47  476/1528  4.47  4.14  4.12  4.11  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  2  4 16  4.64  395/1650  4.64  4.29  4.22  4.20  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 9 9  4.42  531/1626  4.42  3.99  4.11  4.06  4.42


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  0 22  4.91  248/1559  4.91  4.53  4.46  4.40  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  1  1  2  0 19  4.52 1231/1560  4.52  4.69  4.72  4.73  4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  0 20  4.74  395/1549  4.74  4.14  4.31  4.25  4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  0  2  2 18  4.57  643/1546  4.57  4.33  4.32  4.30  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 11 2 1 2 2 5  3.58 1000/1323  3.58  3.71  4.00  4.08  3.58


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 3 0 2 1 5  3.45 1122/1384  3.45  3.49  4.10  4.07  3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 3 0 0 2 5  3.60 1156/1378  3.60  3.59  4.29  4.25  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 0 1 3 4  4.00  977/1378  4.00  3.61  4.31  4.26  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   7  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.01  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  21   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0 0 1 0 2  4.33 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 1 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18  4.25  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64  4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45  3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97  4.30  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.00  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     22  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       22  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****
```

Enrollment: 55
Questionnaires: 24   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   2   0.00-0.99   0   A   9   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   11
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   4   C   2   General   0   Under-grad   24   Non-major   24
84-150   5   3.00-3.49   4   D   1
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   22
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0101                  University of Maryland                              Page 1062
Title          INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR              Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    GOBBERT, MATTHI                      Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    50
Questionnaires: 26                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  2  4 13   6  3.81 1414/1670  4.27  4.22  4.31 4.32  3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  3  5 11   7  3.85 1357/1666  4.23  4.27  4.27 4.27  3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  2  3 10  11  4.15  956/1406  4.41  4.33  4.32 4.39  4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   6  0  0  4 10   6  4.10 1028/1615  4.19  4.15  4.24 4.29  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4  2  0  7  5   8  3.77 1129/1566  4.08  3.76  4.07 4.00  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12 0  0  2  4   8  4.43  532/1528  4.38  4.14  4.12 4.11  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  2  3  5  16  4.35  794/1650  4.43  4.29  4.22 4.20  4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  1  25  4.96  270/1667  4.97  4.81  4.67 4.64  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1 3  9 10   1  3.29 1476/1626  3.79  3.99  4.11 4.06  3.29

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  3  7  16  4.50  896/1559  4.48  4.53  4.46 4.40  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  1  5  9  11  4.15 1442/1560  4.50  4.69  4.72 4.73  4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  5  9  8   3  3.27 1457/1549  3.95  4.14  4.31 4.25  3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  3  4  5 10   4  3.31 1432/1546  3.90  4.33  4.32 4.30  3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 1  1  4  5  11  4.09  659/1323  3.85  3.71  4.00 4.08  4.09

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 3  2  3  1   0  2.22 1357/1384  2.75  3.49  4.10 4.07  2.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 2  3  2  1   1  2.56 1344/1378  3.28  3.59  4.29 4.25  2.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 1 3  4  0   1  2.67 1340/1378  3.12  3.61  4.31 4.26  2.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 16   1  0  2  2  4   1  3.44  743/ 904  3.44  3.64  4.03 4.01  3.44

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25 0 0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   25   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2       0.00-0.99    1      A   9        Required for Majors   0      Graduate    0       Major        4
28-55      6       1.00-1.99    0      B  11
56-83      5       2.00-2.99    3      C   4        General               0      Under-grad  26      Non-major   22
84-150     3       3.00-3.49    6      D   0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    7      F   0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   1                                    responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                24
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0201              University of Maryland                         Page 1063
Title        INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR          Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SHEN, JINGLAI                    Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires: 15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                               Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  1  5  9  4.53  632/1670  4.27 4.22  4.31 4.32  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  5  8  4.40  784/1666  4.23 4.27  4.27 4.27  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  340/1406  4.41 4.33  4.32 4.39  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  6  0  0  3  2  4  4.11 1018/1615  4.19 4.15  4.24 4.29  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  2  1  3  8  4.21  686/1566  4.08 3.76  4.07 4.00  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  1  0  0  1  7  4.44  504/1528  4.38 4.14  4.12 4.11  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  4 10  4.60  429/1650  4.43 4.29  4.22 4.20  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1667  4.97 4.81  4.67 4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0  5  4  2  3.73 1275/1626  3.79 3.99  4.11 4.06  3.73

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  4 10  4.60  772/1559  4.48 4.53  4.46 4.40  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  1  1  6  6  4.21 1421/1560  4.50 4.69  4.72 4.73  4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  2  0  5  7  4.21 1010/1549  3.95 4.14  4.31 4.25  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  2  1  0  5  6  3.86 1252/1546  3.90 4.33  4.32 4.30  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 11 0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1323  3.85 3.71  4.00 4.08  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1384  2.75 3.49  4.10 4.07  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1378  3.28 3.59  4.29 4.25  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1378  3.12 3.61  4.31 4.26  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  12  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 904  3.44 3.64  4.03 4.01  ****

                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 239  **** 4.67  4.21 4.33  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2      0.00-0.99   0        A   8      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major      4
28-55     5      1.00-1.99   0        B   5
56-83     3      2.00-2.99   2        C   0      General              0     Under-grad  15      Non-major 11
84-150    0      3.00-3.49   1        D   0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   6        F   0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               12
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0301            University of Maryland                           Page 1064
Title        INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR         Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  LO, JAMES T                       Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  47
Questionnaires: 31              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  3  3  5  19  4.23 1027/1670  4.27  4.22  4.31  4.32  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  7  6  17  4.26  967/1666  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.27  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  4 11  15  4.26  876/1406  4.41  4.33  4.32  4.39  4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11  0  0  4  4  12  4.40  687/1615  4.19  4.15  4.24  4.29  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  1  1  4  8  14  4.18  724/1566  4.08  3.76  4.07  4.00  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 0  1  2  4  11  4.39  580/1528  4.38  4.14  4.12  4.11  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  4  9  18  4.45  645/1650  4.43  4.29  4.22  4.20  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  31  5.00    1/1667  4.97  4.81  4.67  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  2  7 11   5  3.76 1247/1626  3.79  3.99  4.11  4.06  3.76


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  1  2  4  4  19  4.27 1150/1559  4.48  4.53  4.46  4.40  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  2  4  24  4.73  985/1560  4.50  4.69  4.72  4.73  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  3  6  7  12  3.90 1241/1549  3.95  4.14  4.31  4.25  3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  4  1  3  6  16  3.97 1176/1546  3.90  4.33  4.32  4.30  3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 19 1  0  4  2   3  3.60  990/1323  3.85  3.71  4.00  4.08  3.60


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25  0  1  1  1  0   3  3.50 ****/1384  2.75  3.49  4.10  4.07  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24  0  0  1  2  2   2  3.71 ****/1378  3.28  3.59  4.29  4.25  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0  0  0  1  3   2  4.17 ****/1378  3.12  3.61  4.31  4.26  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  25   4  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 904  3.44  3.64  4.03  4.01  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0      A   7        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0       Major         1
  28-55     5        1.00-1.99   0      B  14
  56-83     6        2.00-2.99   3      C   5        General              0     Under-grad   31       Non-major    30
  84-150    2        3.00-3.49   3      D   0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   7      F   0        Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               28
                                        ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 221  0401            University of Maryland                         Page 1065
Title          INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR      Baltimore County                             AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:    PITTENGER, ARTH             Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires: 22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                      Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  3  5 14 4.50  665/1670  4.27 4.22  4.31 4.32  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  6 13 4.41  784/1666  4.23 4.27  4.27 4.27  4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  4 15 4.50  597/1406  4.41 4.33  4.32 4.39  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  1  3  3  7 4.14  990/1615  4.19 4.15  4.24 4.29  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  1  0  3  6  9 4.16  743/1566  4.08 3.76  4.07 4.00  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6 0 0 2  7  6 4.27  697/1528  4.38 4.14  4.12 4.11  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  3  5 12 4.33  806/1650  4.43 4.29  4.22 4.20  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2 19 4.90  675/1667  4.97 4.81  4.67 4.64  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 4  5 12 4.38  584/1626  3.79 3.99  4.11 4.06  4.38


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  1  2  2 15 4.55  834/1559  4.48 4.53  4.46 4.40  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  0 19 4.90  596/1560  4.50 4.69  4.72 4.73  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  2  1  4 13 4.40  816/1549  3.95 4.14  4.31 4.25  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  0  3  1 15 4.45  795/1546  3.90 4.33  4.32 4.30  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 15 1 0  0  1  3 4.00 ****/1323  3.85 3.71  4.00 4.08  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 1 2 0  2  2 3.29 1191/1384  2.75 3.49  4.10 4.07  3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0 1 2  0  4 4.00  970/1378  3.28 3.59  4.29 4.25  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 2 0 1 0  4 3.57 1172/1378  3.12 3.61  4.31 4.26  3.57
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2        0.00-0.99    0       A    5      Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0     Major       3
28-55      7        1.00-1.99    0       B    9
56-83      2        2.00-2.99    2       C    5      General               0    Under-grad  22     Non-major  19
84-150     2        3.00-3.49    4       D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    7       F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                22
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1066
Title       INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT          Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  KOGAN, JACOB                      Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     56
Questionnaires:  28              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   4   3  10  11  4.00 1216/1670  4.14 4.22  4.31 4.32  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   1  10   7   9  3.79 1393/1666  3.94 4.27  4.27 4.27  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   3  11  12  4.14  964/1406  4.12 4.33  4.32 4.39  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  15   1   1   3   5   3  3.62 1411/1615  3.87 4.15  4.24 4.29  3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   1   3   5   6   6  3.62 1225/1566  3.71 3.76  4.07 4.00  3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 18   0   2   1   5   2  3.70 1182/1528  4.03 4.14  4.12 4.11  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   3  15   9  4.11 1079/1650  4.15 4.29  4.22 4.20  4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  27  4.96  270/1667  4.90 4.81  4.67 4.64  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   1   0  11   9   4  3.60 1347/1626  3.83 3.99  4.11 4.06  3.60


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   2   0   5  12   8  3.89 1360/1559  4.01 4.53  4.46 4.40  3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   1   1   0  10  15  4.37 1347/1560  4.64 4.69  4.72 4.73  4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   3   0   9  11   4  3.48 1397/1549  3.89 4.14  4.31 4.25  3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   2   5  10   9  3.89 1240/1546  4.12 4.33  4.32 4.30  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 24  0   1   2   0   0  2.67 ****/1323  3.29 3.71  4.00 4.08  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0   3   1   2   0   0  1.83 ****/1384  3.27 3.49  4.10 4.07  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20  0   1   0   3   1   3  3.63 1150/1378  3.49 3.59  4.29 4.25  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0   1   0   4   0   3  3.50 1189/1378  3.47 3.61  4.31 4.26  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  20   7   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 904  **** 3.64  4.03 4.01  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    27   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      27   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       27   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     27   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 ****  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1067
Title          INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT     Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    ROSTAMIAN, ROUB            Spring 2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    61
Questionnaires: 35              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2  9  23  4.51   654/1670  4.14  4.22  4.31  4.32  4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  6  9  19  4.31   895/1666  3.94  4.27  4.27  4.27  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  4  4 10  16  4.03  1045/1406  4.12  4.33  4.32  4.39  4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  13  1  2  3  7   9  3.95  1158/1615  3.87  4.15  4.24  4.29  3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 15  2  2  4  3   7  3.61  1225/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.00  3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 16 0 0  3  2  11  4.50   421/1528  4.03  4.14  4.12  4.11  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  1  4  7  19  4.42   705/1650  4.15  4.29  4.22  4.20  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0  2  30  4.94   472/1667  4.90  4.81  4.67  4.64  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0  5 11  10  4.19   797/1626  3.83  3.99  4.11  4.06  4.19


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  2 11  20  4.55   846/1559  4.01  4.53  4.46  4.40  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  6  27  4.82   829/1560  4.64  4.69  4.72  4.73  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  4  8  20  4.42   789/1549  3.89  4.14  4.31  4.25  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  2  1  5  25  4.61   595/1546  4.12  4.33  4.32  4.30  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 4 5  7  2  10  3.32  1102/1323  3.29  3.71  4.00  4.08  3.32


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 2 0 2  1   3  3.38  ****/1384  3.27  3.49  4.10  4.07  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 28 0 3 0 0  1   3  3.14  ****/1378  3.49  3.59  4.29  4.25  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 29 0 0 0 2  1   3  4.17  ****/1378  3.47  3.61  4.31  4.26  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  28   6  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.01  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3        0.00-0.99    0     A   12        Required for Majors  0      Graduate    1      Major       5
28-55      7        1.00-1.99    0     B   10                                                       
56-83      5        2.00-2.99    5     C    7        General              1      Under-grad  34     Non-major  30
84-150     4        3.00-3.49    2     D    0                                                       
Grad.      1        3.50-4.00   13     F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               27
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 225  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1068
Title        INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT        Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   POTRA, FLORIAN               Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   61
Questionnaires: 36                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  3  4 14 13  3.92 1331/1670  4.14  4.22  4.31  4.32  3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  4  7 16  8  3.72 1424/1666  3.94  4.27  4.27  4.27  3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  4 14 16  4.19  924/1406  4.12  4.33  4.32  4.39  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  12  1  1  6  4 12  4.04 1061/1615  3.87  4.15  4.24  4.29  4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  8  1  1  7  9  9  3.89 1029/1566  3.71  3.76  4.07  4.00  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 14  0  2  6  5  8  3.90 1039/1528  4.03  4.14  4.12  4.11  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  3  7  8 16  3.92 1263/1650  4.15  4.29  4.22  4.20  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  2  3 29  4.79  873/1667  4.90  4.81  4.67  4.64  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  1  1  2  4 17  3  3.70 1289/1626  3.83  3.99  4.11  4.06  3.70


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  3  3  8  9 10  3.61 1448/1559  4.01  4.53  4.46  4.40  3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  2  5 27  4.74  985/1560  4.64  4.69  4.72  4.73  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  2  3  7 11 11  3.76 1303/1549  3.89  4.14  4.31  4.25  3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1  2  3  7  6 15  3.88 1244/1546  4.12  4.33  4.32  4.30  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 14  2  3  4  3  4  3.25 1125/1323  3.29  3.71  4.00  4.08  3.25


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25  0  2  2  1  3  3  3.27 1194/1384  3.27  3.49  4.10  4.07  3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25  0  2  1  2  3  3  3.36 1239/1378  3.49  3.59  4.29  4.25  3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27  0  1  2  0  4  2  3.44 1213/1378  3.47  3.61  4.31  4.26  3.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  26   6  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.01  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18  4.25  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64  4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45  3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97  4.30  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.00  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     35   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0101           University of Maryland                         Page 1069
Title        MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS          Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  LYNN, YEN-MOW                    Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    45
Questionnaires:  16                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  1  2  6  7  4.19 1071/1670  4.38  4.22  4.31  4.32  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  1  3  5  6  3.88 1337/1666  4.11  4.27  4.27  4.27  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  4  3  9  4.31  823/1406  4.39  4.33  4.32  4.39  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4  0  1  4  3  4  3.83 1276/1615  3.85  4.15  4.24  4.29  3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  1  1  4  2  5  3.69 1185/1566  3.73  3.76  4.07  4.00  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  2  5  2  4.00  899/1528  3.90  4.14  4.12  4.11  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  3  2 10  4.31  831/1650  4.23  4.29  4.22  4.20  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  730/1667  4.64  4.81  4.67  4.64  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  1  5  5  2  3.43 1427/1626  3.77  3.99  4.11  4.06  3.43


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  1  2  4  9  4.31 1112/1559  4.48  4.53  4.46  4.40  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  4  3  9  4.31 1390/1560  4.59  4.69  4.72  4.73  4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  5  2  7  2  3.38 1436/1549  3.78  4.14  4.31  4.25  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  1  2  6  6  3.94 1204/1546  4.15  4.33  4.32  4.30  3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 13  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/1323  3.42  3.71  4.00  4.08  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  3  0  1  0  0  1.50 1378/1384  2.25  3.49  4.10  4.07  1.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  2  1  0  1  0  2.00 1368/1378  3.05  3.59  4.29  4.25  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  0  1  2  0  1  3.25 1276/1378  3.30  3.61  4.31  4.26  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  3  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.01  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.61  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2       0.00-0.99    0        A    4         Required for Majors   0       Graduate     0        Major       1
28-55     6       1.00-1.99    0        B    7
56-83     1       2.00-2.99    1        C    3         General               1       Under-grad  16        Non-major  15
84-150    1       3.00-3.49    4        D    0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    4        F    0         Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                13
                                        ?    0
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                      NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   1   8  27  4.72   401/1670   4.38  4.22  4.31  4.32  4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   2   1  13  20  4.42   767/1666   4.11  4.27  4.27  4.27  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   1   0   2   8  25  4.56   546/1406   4.39  4.33  4.32  4.39  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  12   1   1   4   5  13  4.17   972/1615   3.85  4.15  4.24  4.29  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   8   0   2   9   7  10  3.89  1019/1566   3.73  3.76  4.07  4.00  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 15   1   2   4   3  11  4.00   899/1528   3.90  4.14  4.12  4.11  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   1   7  10  18  4.25   903/1650   4.23  4.29  4.22  4.20  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0  33   3  4.08  1482/1667   4.64  4.81  4.67  4.64  4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  1   1   0   1  12  15  4.38   595/1626   3.77  3.99  4.11  4.06  4.38


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   6  29  4.83   403/1559   4.48  4.53  4.46  4.40  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   3  33  4.92   536/1560   4.59  4.69  4.72  4.73  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   1   5  12  18  4.31   936/1549   3.78  4.14  4.31  4.25  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   1   0   4   4  27  4.56   655/1546   4.15  4.33  4.32  4.30  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 18   2   0   7   3   6  3.61   985/1323   3.42  3.71  4.00  4.08  3.61


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26   0   2   2   3   2   2  3.00  1260/1384   2.25  3.49  4.10  4.07  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26   0   0   0   5   0   6  4.09   935/1378   3.05  3.59  4.29  4.25  4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25  0   0   1   3   2   6  4.08   953/1378   3.30  3.61  4.31  4.26  4.08
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                       Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4        0.00-0.99    0         A    6       Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0        Major        12
28-55      7        1.00-1.99    1         B   17
56-83      6        2.00-2.99    5         C   10       General               0      Under-grad   37        Non-major    25
84-150     1        3.00-3.49    5         D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    9         F    1       Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                32
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 251  0301          University of Maryland                         Page 1071
Title       MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS       Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  GULER, OSMAN                 Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   60
Questionnaires:  26            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  5  7 13  4.23 1017/1670  4.38 4.22  4.31 4.32  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  6  6 12  4.04 1180/1666  4.11 4.27  4.27 4.27  4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2 11 12  4.31  836/1406  4.39 4.33  4.32 4.39  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  15  1  1  2  5  2  3.55 1436/1615  3.85 4.15  4.24 4.29  3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  11  0  1  6  6  2  3.60 1230/1566  3.73 3.76  4.07 4.00  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 16  0  1  2  6  1  3.70 1182/1528  3.90 4.14  4.12 4.11  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  3  4  6 13  4.12 1067/1650  4.23 4.29  4.22 4.20  4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 25  4.96  270/1667  4.64 4.81  4.67 4.64  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1  1  7 12  1  3.50 1384/1626  3.77 3.99  4.11 4.06  3.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  1  1  9 14  4.31 1122/1559  4.48 4.53  4.46 4.40  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  2  8 16  4.54 1222/1560  4.59 4.69  4.72 4.73  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  3  7  8  7  3.65 1348/1549  3.78 4.14  4.31 4.25  3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  0  4 10  9  3.96 1176/1546  4.15 4.33  4.32 4.30  3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12  3  2  2  1  5  3.23 1132/1323  3.42 3.71  4.00 4.08  3.23


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20  0  1  1  2  2  0  2.83 ****/1384  2.25 3.49  4.10 4.07  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20  0  2  1  0  2  1  2.83 ****/1378  3.05 3.59  4.29 4.25  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0  2  2  1  1  1  2.57 1347/1378  3.30 3.61  4.31 4.26  2.57


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99    0      A    8      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major        4
 28-55      6      1.00-1.99    0      B    5
 56-83      4      2.00-2.99    6      C   11      General               2     Under-grad   26      Non-major   22
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49    1      D    1
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5      F    1      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                21
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0101                University of Maryland                          Page 1072
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I             Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   POTRA, FLORIAN                    Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                    General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  737/1670   4.64  4.22   4.31 4.24  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  943/1666   4.36  4.27   4.27 4.18  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45  656/1406   4.55  4.33   4.32 4.22  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  4  1  0  0  3  3  4.00 1083/1615   4.14  4.15   4.24 4.18  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  559/1566   4.32  3.76   4.07 4.04  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  4  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  787/1528   4.31  4.14   4.12 4.07  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  499/1650   4.49  4.29   4.22 4.12  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  897/1667   4.93  4.81   4.67 4.67  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  670/1626   4.38  3.99   4.11 4.06  4.30


                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  3  3  5  4.18 1205/1559   4.59  4.53   4.46 4.40  4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  829/1560   4.94  4.69   4.72 4.67  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  5  4  4.18 1036/1549   4.26  4.14   4.31 4.25  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27  971/1546   4.37  4.33   4.32 4.24  4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  7  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  545/1323   4.38  3.71   4.00 3.99  4.25


                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  324/1384   4.46  3.49   4.10 4.12  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  970/1378   4.28  3.59   4.29 4.30  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 1255/1378   3.83  3.61   4.31 4.33  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 904   ****  3.64   4.03 4.03  ****


                    Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 239   ****  4.67   4.21 3.99  ****


                    Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  41   ****  ****   4.50 4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  38   ****  ****   4.19 3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38   ****  ****   4.62 4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39   ****  ****   4.27 4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31   ****  ****   4.47 4.51  ****


                    Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28   ****  ****   4.64 3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16   ****  ****   4.67 4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  27   ****  ****   4.54 2.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  10   ****  ****   4.84 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/   6   ****  ****   4.92 ****  ****


                            Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0201                University of Maryland                           Page 1073
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I            Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  DRAGANESCU, AND                  Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires:  16                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81   290/1670  4.64  4.22  4.31  4.24  4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  4  9  4.47   686/1666  4.36  4.27  4.27  4.18  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  0  1  5  9  4.53   566/1406  4.55  4.33  4.32  4.22  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  6  0  1  1  4  4  4.10  1028/1615  4.14  4.15  4.24  4.18  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  1  1  2  6  4.30   589/1566  4.32  3.76  4.07  4.04  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 0 0 1 3 4 4.38   590/1528  4.31  4.14  4.12  4.07  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  0  0  0  2  2 10  4.57   471/1650  4.49  4.29  4.22  4.12  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00     1/1667  4.93  4.81  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 6 9 4.60   324/1626  4.38  3.99  4.11  4.06  4.60


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00     1/1559  4.59  4.53  4.46  4.40  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00     1/1560  4.94  4.69  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60   562/1549  4.26  4.14  4.31  4.25  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67   520/1546  4.37  4.33  4.32  4.24  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 1 0 3 4.50   326/1323  4.38  3.71  4.00  3.99  4.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50   434/1384  4.46  3.49  4.10  4.12  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25   860/1378  4.28  3.59  4.29  4.30  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 1110/1378  3.83  3.61  4.31  4.33  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 12  3  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.03  ****


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.25  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  3.96  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    14  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     14  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  2.63  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4          0.00-0.99   0       A   8          Required for Majors   0        Graduate      0          Major       6
 28-55     1          1.00-1.99   0       B   2                                         Under-grad   16
 56-83     2          2.00-2.99   0       C   4          General               0        Under-grad   16          Non-major  10
 84-150    3          3.00-3.49   3       D   0
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00   5       F   0          Electives             1        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                         responses to be significant
                                          I   0          Other                14
                                          ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 301  0301              University of Maryland                         Page 1074
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I              Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ARMSTRONG, THOM                    Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  6                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  0  5  4.67   479/1670   4.64  4.22  4.31  4.24  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33   870/1666   4.36  4.27  4.27  4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   423/1406   4.55  4.33  4.32  4.22  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33   775/1615   4.14  4.15  4.24  4.18  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33   559/1566   4.32  3.76  4.07  4.04  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   560/1528   4.31  4.14  4.12  4.07  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33   806/1650   4.49  4.29  4.22  4.12  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1667   4.93  4.81  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  1  1  2  4.25   728/1626   4.38  3.99  4.11  4.06  4.25


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   772/1559   4.59  4.53  4.46  4.40  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1560   4.94  4.69  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  1146/1549   4.26  4.14  4.31  4.25  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  1056/1546   4.37  4.33  4.32  4.24  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  5  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/1323   4.38  3.71  4.00  3.99  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  0  1  3  4.20   712/1384   4.46  3.49  4.10  4.12  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   525/1378   4.28  3.59  4.29  4.30  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   751/1378   3.83  3.61  4.31  4.33  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   4  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 904   ****  3.64  4.03  4.03  ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 232   ****  4.00  4.19  4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 239   ****  4.67  4.21  3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 230   ****  5.00  4.44  4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 231   ****  5.00  4.31  4.11  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 302  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1075
Title        INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II           Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  RATHINAM, MURUH                   Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     33
Questionnaires:  17                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  5 10  4.47  708/1670  4.47  4.22  4.31  4.24  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  0  6 10  4.47  670/1666  4.47  4.27  4.27  4.18  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  247/1406  4.82  4.33  4.32  4.22  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  0  7  8  4.53  520/1615  4.53  4.15  4.24  4.18  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  0  1  3  1  4  3.89 1029/1566  3.89  3.76  4.07  4.04  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0  1  3  2  7  4.15  796/1528  4.15  4.14  4.12  4.07  4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63  406/1650  4.63  4.29  4.22  4.12  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  6 11  4.65 1042/1667  4.65  4.81  4.67  4.67  4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  1  5  6  4.42  547/1626  4.42  3.99  4.11  4.06  4.42


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  2  6  9  4.41 1009/1559  4.41  4.53  4.46  4.40  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  1  0  0  3 13  4.59 1180/1560  4.59  4.69  4.72  4.67  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71  439/1549  4.71  4.14  4.31  4.25  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  0  1  1 14  4.59  619/1546  4.59  4.33  4.32  4.24  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/1323  ****  3.71  4.00  3.99  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/1384  ****  3.49  4.10  4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1378  ****  3.59  4.29  4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1378  ****  3.61  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   14  1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.03  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1       A    5      Required for Majors  0    Graduate    1     Major       10
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    6                               Under-grad  16
56-83      1      2.00-2.99    2       C    5      General              2    Under-grad  16    Non-major    7
84-150     6      3.00-3.49    2       D    0
Grad.      1      3.50-4.00    4       F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               14
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 306  0101                  University of Maryland                        Page 1076
Title         GEOMETRY                            Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   GARTSIDE, J                          Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   23
Questionnaires:  8                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  1  1  4  2  3.88 1365/1670  3.88  4.22  4.31 4.24  3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  6  1  3.88 1337/1666  3.88  4.27  4.27 4.18  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  597/1406  4.50  4.33  4.32 4.22  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  2  2  2  4.00 1083/1615  4.00  4.15  4.24 4.18  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  5  2  1  3.50 1285/1566  3.50  3.76  4.07 4.04  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  2  0  0  0  5  1  4.17  787/1528  4.17  4.14  4.12 4.07  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  2  1  0  5  4.00 1135/1650  4.00  4.29  4.22 4.12  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  0  0  0  7  0  4.00 1524/1667  4.00  4.81  4.67 4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  1  0  1  2  3  0  3.33 1462/1626  3.33  3.99  4.11 4.06  3.33


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00 1280/1559  4.00  4.53  4.46 4.40  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  1  1  4  1  3.71 1507/1560  3.71  4.69  4.72 4.67  3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  1  2  3  1  3.57 1372/1549  3.57  4.14  4.31 4.25  3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1  0  0  3  1  2  3.83 1260/1546  3.83  4.33  4.32 4.24  3.83


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 1362/1384  2.00  3.49  4.10 4.12  2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1372/1378  1.50  3.59  4.29 4.30  1.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1375/1378  1.50  3.61  4.31 4.33  1.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03 4.03  ****


                  Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21 3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44 4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          7   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31 4.11  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 341  0101                   University of Maryland                                Page 1077
Title          COMPUTATIONAL METHODS              Baltimore County                                     AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    DRAGANESCU, AND                    Spring 2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires:  30                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4  16  10  4.20 1060/1670  4.20 4.22  4.31 4.24  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   1   3  13  12  4.24  979/1666  4.24 4.27  4.27 4.18  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   5  22  4.63  459/1406  4.63 4.33  4.32 4.22  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   9   0   1   6   9   4  3.80 1294/1615  3.80 4.15  4.24 4.18  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  14  10   1   3   1   1  1.88 1559/1566  1.88 3.76  4.07 4.04  1.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  10   1   0   3   7   9  4.15  796/1528  4.15 4.14  4.12 4.07  4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   3  10  17  4.47  630/1650  4.47 4.29  4.22 4.12  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   1   0  18  11  4.30 1334/1667  4.30 4.81  4.67 4.67  4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4   1   0   1   3  13   8  4.12  877/1626  4.12 3.99  4.11 4.06  4.12


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   3  25  4.77  503/1559  4.77 4.53  4.46 4.40  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   4  26  4.87  699/1560  4.87 4.69  4.72 4.67  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   2   3  13  12  4.17 1053/1549  4.17 4.14  4.31 4.25  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   2   4   2  22  4.47  768/1546  4.47 4.33  4.32 4.24  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   5   0   1  10   7   7  3.80  894/1323  3.80 3.71  4.00 3.99  3.80


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26   0   1   0   2   0   1  3.00 ****/1384  **** 3.49  4.10 4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25   0   1   0   1   2   1  3.40 ****/1378  **** 3.59  4.29 4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26   0   1   0   0   2   1  3.50 ****/1378  **** 3.61  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  24   5   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 904  **** 3.64  4.03 4.03  ****
```

```
                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0      A   18      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major       21
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    8                                                      
56-83      4       2.00-2.99    4      C    3      General              8      Under-grad  30      Non-major    9
84-150    16       3.00-3.49    5      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   11      F    0      Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               22
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 404  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1078
Title         INTRO PART DIFF EQ I           Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BELL, JONATHAN                 Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   32
Questionnaires: 19                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  6 13  4.68  453/1670  4.68  4.22  4.31  4.45  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  5 14  4.74  333/1666  4.74  4.27  4.27  4.35  4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  7 12  4.63  459/1406  4.63  4.33  4.32  4.48  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  5  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  552/1615  4.50  4.15  4.24  4.37  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  5  0  4  1  4  2.93 1506/1566  2.93  3.76  4.07  4.17  2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  221/1528  4.75  4.14  4.12  4.26  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  6 11  4.56  499/1650  4.56  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  2  9  5  4.19  808/1626  4.19  3.99  4.11  4.28  4.19


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  3 16  4.84  371/1559  4.84  4.53  4.46  4.58  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  5 14  4.74  985/1560  4.74  4.69  4.72  4.80  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  4  2 10  4.38  852/1549  4.38  4.14  4.31  4.43  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  3  2 12  4.53  691/1546  4.53  4.33  4.32  4.43  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  5  1  0  3  0  8  4.17  612/1323  4.17  3.71  4.00  4.10  4.17


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/1384  ****  3.49  4.10  4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1378  ****  3.59  4.29  4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/1378  ****  3.61  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  15  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.22  ****


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.00  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21  4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  5.00  4.44  4.30  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 231  ****  5.00  4.31  4.24  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  5.00  4.18  4.09  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65  4.80  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.57  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.45  4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  80  ****  3.00  3.97  3.67  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  4.98  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.02  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.80  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: MATH 407  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1079
Title      MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH          Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   CAMPBELL, ROBER              Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   17
Questionnaires:  8                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions           NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75   363/1670  4.75  4.22  4.31  4.45  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  0  6  4.50   622/1666  4.50  4.27  4.27  4.35  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   471/1406  4.63  4.33  4.32  4.48  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   423/1615  4.63  4.15  4.24  4.37  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  0  0  3  1  1  3.60  1230/1566  3.60  3.76  4.07  4.17  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  3  3  4.13   823/1528  4.13  4.14  4.12  4.26  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25   903/1650  4.25  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38   595/1626  4.38  3.99  4.11  4.28  4.38


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  1157/1559  4.25  4.53  4.46  4.58  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   948/1560  4.75  4.69  4.72  4.80  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  1  4  2  3.88  1251/1549  3.88  4.14  4.31  4.43  3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  1  1  2  4  4.13  1087/1546  4.13  4.33  4.32  4.43  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  1  0  3  4  4.25   545/1323  4.25  3.71  4.00  4.10  4.25


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/1384  ****  3.49  4.10  4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1378  ****  3.59  4.29  4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1378  ****  3.61  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.22  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 10   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1   8  4.70   440/1670  4.70  4.22  4.31  4.45  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1   9  4.90   173/1666  4.90  4.27  4.27  4.35  4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  10  5.00     1/1406  5.00  4.33  4.32  4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  0  0   7  5.00     1/1615  5.00  4.15  4.24  4.37  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  0  1   4  4.80   187/1566  4.80  3.76  4.07  4.17  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0  0  0  2   5  4.71   260/1528  4.71  4.14  4.12  4.26  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1   8  4.70   327/1650  4.70  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  1   8  4.89   712/1667  4.89  4.81  4.67  4.73  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  3   6  4.67   278/1626  4.67  3.99  4.11  4.28  4.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  3   6  4.50   896/1559  4.50  4.53  4.46  4.58  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  10  5.00     1/1560  5.00  4.69  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  1   8  4.70   451/1549  4.70  4.14  4.31  4.43  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  0  0   9  4.70   482/1546  4.70  4.33  4.32  4.43  4.70

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  1  2  0   1  3.25  1200/1384  3.25  3.49  4.10  4.32  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  2   2  4.50   603/1378  4.50  3.59  4.29  4.55  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  1  2   1  4.00   977/1378  4.00  3.61  4.31  4.60  4.00
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 409  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1081
Title        INTRO TO MATH LOGIC           Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ARMSTRONG, THOM               Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   26
Questionnaires: 12                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
             --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0  0  0  2  2  4  4 3.83 1393/1670  3.83  4.22  4.31 4.45  3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      1  0  0  1  3  4  3 3.82 1376/1666  3.82  4.27  4.27 4.35  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  9  2 4.08 1009/1406  4.08  4.33  4.32 4.48  4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0  5  0  0  1  5  1 4.00 1083/1615  4.00  4.15  4.24 4.37  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  4  0  0  1  5  2 4.13  771/1566  4.13  3.76  4.07 4.17  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  1  3  1 4.00  899/1528  4.00  4.14  4.12 4.26  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0  1  0  0  3  4  4 4.09 1084/1650  4.09  4.29  4.22 4.28  4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0  1  0  0  0  1 10 4.91  675/1667  4.91  4.81  4.67 4.73  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  6  1  2 3.56 1365/1626  3.56  3.99  4.11 4.28  3.56

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          1  0  0  1  1  5  4 4.09 1258/1559  4.09  4.53  4.46 4.58  4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1  0  0  0  1  3  7 4.55 1214/1560  4.55  4.69  4.72 4.80  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  2  5  3  1 3.27 1455/1549  3.27  4.14  4.31 4.43  3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       1  0  1  2  4  1  3 3.27 1438/1546  3.27  4.33  4.32 4.43  3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  7  0  0  2  1  0 3.33 1099/1323  3.33  3.71  4.00 4.10  3.33

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  1  2  2  0 3.20 1216/1384  3.20  3.49  4.10 4.32  3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  8  0  1  1  1  1  0 2.50 1348/1378  2.50  3.59  4.29 4.55  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  2  1  0 3.33 1255/1378  3.33  3.61  4.31 4.60  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                    7  3  0  1  1  0  0 2.50 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03 4.22  ****

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 239  ****  4.67  4.21 4.26  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 423  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1082
Title        DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY          Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ZWECK, JOHN                       Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires:  10                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  206/1670  4.90  4.22  4.31  4.45  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   6  4.60  490/1666  4.60  4.27  4.27  4.35  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70  387/1406  4.70  4.33  4.32  4.48  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  326/1615  4.71  4.15  4.24  4.37  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80  187/1566  4.80  3.76  4.07  4.17  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  136/1528  4.88  4.14  4.12  4.26  4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70  327/1650  4.70  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0   1   0   1   7  4.56  363/1626  4.56  3.99  4.11  4.28  4.56


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78  486/1559  4.78  4.53  4.46  4.58  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.69  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   3   0   6  4.33  900/1549  4.33  4.14  4.31  4.43  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1546  5.00  4.33  4.32  4.43  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 6  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/1323  ****  3.71  4.00  4.10  ****


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   1   0   0   2  4.00  820/1384  4.00  3.49  4.10  4.32  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  797/1378  4.33  3.59  4.29  4.55  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   1   0   2  4.33  813/1378  4.33  3.61  4.31  4.60  4.33


                                         Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 432  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1083
Title          HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS        Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    SEIDMAN, THOMAS               Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies    Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  943/1670  4.31 4.22 4.31 4.45 4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  4  2  5  2  3.38 1549/1666  3.38 4.27 4.27 4.35 3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  4  3  1  5  3.54 1267/1406  3.54 4.33 4.32 4.48 3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  5  4  4  3.92 1203/1615  3.92 4.15 4.24 4.37 3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0  1  0  4  0  7  4.00  851/1566  4.00 3.76 4.07 4.17 4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 5 3 4 3.92 1025/1528  3.92 4.14 4.12 4.26 3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  3  5  2  1  0  1  1.89 1641/1650  1.89 4.29 4.22 4.28 1.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  805/1667  4.83 4.81 4.67 4.73 4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 3 3 5 1 3.33 1462/1626  3.33 3.99 4.11 4.28 3.33


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  3  1  5  4  3.77 1406/1559  3.77 4.53 4.46 4.58 3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  929/1560  4.77 4.69 4.72 4.80 4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  4  2  4  3  3.46 1405/1549  3.46 4.14 4.31 4.43 3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  1  3  4  4  3.69 1317/1546  3.69 4.33 4.32 4.43 3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 1 0 1 0 3 3.80 894/1323  3.80 3.71 4.00 4.10 3.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 1 4 1 0 3.00 1260/1384  3.00 3.49 4.10 4.32 3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17  906/1378  4.17 3.59 4.29 4.55 4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 1 2 3 0 3.33 1255/1378  3.33 3.61 4.31 4.60 3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  5  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 904  **** 3.64 4.03 4.22 ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 239  **** 4.67 4.21 4.26 ****


              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79  **** **** 4.64 4.60 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75  **** **** 4.57 4.56 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 79  **** 5.00 4.45 4.53 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 80  **** 3.00 3.97 3.67 ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 41  **** **** 4.50 4.98 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38  **** **** 4.19 4.36 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 38  **** **** 4.62 4.58 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 39  **** **** 4.27 4.02 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31  **** **** 4.47 4.49 ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 28  **** **** 4.64 5.00 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 16  **** **** 4.67 4.80 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 27  **** **** 4.54 5.00 ****
```

                                   Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1        0.00-0.99   1       A   7        Required for Majors   0     Graduate     1       Major      11
 28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0       B   4
 56-83    0        2.00-2.99   1       C   1        General               3     Under-grad  13       Non-major   3
 84-150   3        3.00-3.49   4       D   0
 Grad.    1        3.50-4.00   2       F   0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                        responses to be significant
I    0              Other              10
?    1
```

```
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  7                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5   Mean      Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   6   4.86   253/1670   4.86  4.22  4.31  4.45  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   6   4.86   216/1666   4.86  4.27  4.27  4.35  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   0   2   5.00     1/1406   5.00  4.33  4.32  4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   1   5   4.83   224/1615   4.83  4.15  4.24  4.37  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5   0   0   0   0   2   5.00     1/1566   5.00  3.76  4.07  4.17  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   6   4.86   147/1528   4.86  4.14  4.12  4.26  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   2   1   0   0   2   1   3.50  1460/1650   3.50  4.29  4.22  4.28  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   7   5.00     1/1667   5.00  4.81  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   0   2   4   4.67   278/1626   4.67  3.99  4.11  4.28  4.67


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   0   0   4   5.00     1/1559   5.00  4.53  4.46  4.58  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0   0   0   0   0   3   5.00     1/1560   5.00  4.69  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   0   0   0   3   5.00     1/1549   5.00  4.14  4.31  4.43  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   0   0   0   3   5.00     1/1546   5.00  4.33  4.32  4.43  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00     1/1384   5.00  3.49  4.10  4.32  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00     1/1378   5.00  3.59  4.29  4.55  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00     1/1378   5.00  3.61  4.31  4.60  5.00


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00     1/  87   5.00  5.00  4.65  4.80  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5  1   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/  79   ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5  1   0   0   0   0   1   5.00  ****/  75   ****  ****  4.57  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    5   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00     1/  79   5.00  5.00  4.45  4.53  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0   1   0   0   0   1   3.00    67/  80   3.00  3.00  3.97  3.67  3.00
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: MATH 481  0101             University of Maryland                            Page 1085
Title        MATH MODELING                   Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ROSTAMIAN, ROUB                  Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires:  15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   3  11  4.67   479/1670   4.67  4.22  4.31  4.45  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   3  10  4.53   582/1666   4.53  4.27  4.27  4.35  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  10   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   261/1406   4.80  4.33  4.32  4.48  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   4  10  4.60   446/1615   4.60  4.15  4.24  4.37  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   0   5   1   8  4.00   851/1566   4.00  3.76  4.07  4.17  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1   0   0   0   3  11  4.79   192/1528   4.79  4.14  4.12  4.26  4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   5   8  4.33   806/1650   4.33  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   0  14  5.00     1/1667   5.00  4.81  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0   0   1   5   7  4.46   467/1626   4.46  3.99  4.11  4.28  4.46


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   4   9  4.57   809/1559   4.57  4.53  4.46  4.58  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   2  12  4.86   725/1560   4.86  4.69  4.72  4.80  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   4  10  4.71   424/1549   4.71  4.14  4.31  4.43  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1   0   0   1   1  12  4.79   370/1546   4.79  4.33  4.32  4.43  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0   0   0   0   1  13  4.93    95/1323   4.93  3.71  4.00  4.10  4.93


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0   1   0   1   1   2  3.60  1057/1384   3.60  3.49  4.10  4.32  3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0   1   1   0   0   3  3.60  1156/1378   3.60  3.59  4.29  4.55  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0   0   1   1   3  4.40   751/1378   4.40  3.61  4.31  4.60  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 904   ****  3.64  4.03  4.22  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 232   ****  4.00  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 239   ****  4.67  4.21  4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 230   ****  5.00  4.44  4.30  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 231   ****  5.00  4.31  4.24  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 218   ****  5.00  4.18  4.09  ****


                 Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79   ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  75   ****  ****  4.57  4.56  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80   ****  3.00  3.97  3.67  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  41   ****  ****  4.50  4.98  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38   ****  ****  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38   ****  ****  4.62  4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39   ****  ****  4.27  4.02  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  28   ****  ****  4.64  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  16   ****  ****  4.67  4.80  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  27   ****  ****  4.54  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 481  0101            University of Maryland                     Page 1085
Title         MATH MODELING                  Baltimore County                      AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   ROSTAMIAN, ROUB                  Spring 2008                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires:  15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MATH 490  0101            University of Maryland                             Page 1086
Title        SPECIAL TOPICS IN MATH          Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BELL, JONATHAN                    Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 13                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  5  6  4.31  943/1670  4.31  4.22  4.31  4.45  4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  7  4  4.25  967/1666  4.25  4.27  4.27  4.35  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   9  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1406  ****  4.33  4.32  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  552/1615  4.50  4.15  4.24  4.37  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  1  2  4  4  4.00  851/1566  4.00  3.76  4.07  4.17  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  421/1528  4.50  4.14  4.12  4.26  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   2  0  0  5  0  5  4.00 1135/1650  4.00  4.29  4.22  4.28  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  3  7  1  3.82 1210/1626  3.82  3.99  4.11  4.28  3.82


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  755/1559  4.62  4.53  4.46  4.58  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  777/1560  4.83  4.69  4.72  4.80  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  4  5  3  3.92 1227/1549  3.92  4.14  4.31  4.43  3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  949/1546  4.31  4.33  4.32  4.43  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  1  2  3  4  4.00  692/1323  4.00  3.71  4.00  4.10  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  670/1384  4.25  3.49  4.10  4.32  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  1  0  2  0  1  3.00 1297/1378  3.00  3.59  4.29  4.55  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 1189/1378  3.50  3.61  4.31  4.60  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   2  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.22  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2        0.00-0.99    0       A   8        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     2        Major      9
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B   4                                                          
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0       C   0        General              7      Under-grad  11        Non-major  4
 84-150    5        3.00-3.49    1       D   0
 Grad.     2        3.50-4.00    8       F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                6
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MATH 611  0101                University of Maryland                           Page 1087
Title        APPLIED ANALYSIS                     Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  GOWDA, MUDDAPPA                        Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires:  9              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1670  5.00  4.22  4.31  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  190/1666  4.89  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  205/1406  4.89  4.33  4.32  4.36  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  446/1615  4.60  4.15  4.24  4.33  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  295/1566  4.67  3.76  4.07  4.20  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  136/1528  4.88  4.14  4.12  4.33  4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  180/1650  4.88  4.29  4.22  4.30  4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  347/1626  4.57  3.99  4.11  4.20  4.57


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1559  5.00  4.53  4.46  4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.69  4.72  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  366/1549  4.75  4.14  4.31  4.37  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  265/1546  4.88  4.33  4.32  4.40  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  6  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1323  ****  3.71  4.00  4.03  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 6   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1216/1670  4.00  4.22  4.31  4.46  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0  0  1  1  2  4.25  967/1666  4.25  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   3   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1406  ****  4.33  4.32  4.36  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0   0  0  0  2  2  4.50  552/1615  4.50  4.15  4.24  4.33  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  1  0  2  1  3.75 1144/1566  3.75  3.76  4.07  4.20  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   0  0  0  2  2  4.50  421/1528  4.50  4.14  4.12  4.33  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0  0  1  0  3  4.50  570/1650  4.50  4.29  4.22  4.30  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  637/1626  4.33  3.99  4.11  4.20  4.33


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0  0  2  2  0  3.50 1461/1559  3.50  4.53  4.46  4.49  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.69  4.72  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0  0  1  1  2  4.25  977/1549  4.25  4.14  4.31  4.37  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0  0  1  0  3  4.50  715/1546  4.50  4.33  4.32  4.40  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1   0  1  0  1  1  3.67  960/1323  3.67  3.71  4.00  4.03  3.67


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1384  ****  3.49  4.10  4.21  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1378  ****  3.59  4.29  4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1378  ****  3.61  4.31  4.51  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  5  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  4.65  ****
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 630  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1089
Title        MATRIX ANALYSIS                 Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MINKOFF, SUSAN                    Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:   9            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   338/1670  4.78  4.22  4.31  4.46  4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67   415/1666  4.67  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44   667/1406  4.44  4.33  4.32  4.36  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  4  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   446/1615  4.60  4.15  4.24  4.33  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   389/1566  4.50  3.76  4.07  4.20  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0  0  0  1  5  4.83   157/1528  4.83  4.14  4.12  4.33  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   272/1650  4.75  4.29  4.22  4.30  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  2  4  2  4.00   953/1626  4.00  3.99  4.11  4.20  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67   673/1559  4.67  4.53  4.46  4.49  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  1090/1560  4.67  4.69  4.72  4.81  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0  0  2  2  5  4.33   900/1549  4.33  4.14  4.31  4.37  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56   655/1546  4.56  4.33  4.32  4.40  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0  1  0  1  3  4.20   590/1323  4.20  3.71  4.00  4.03  4.20


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1  1  1  1  2  3.33  1171/1384  3.33  3.49  4.10  4.21  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0  0  1  1  4  4.50   603/1378  4.50  3.59  4.29  4.42  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  1  1  1  3  4.00   977/1378  4.00  3.61  4.31  4.51  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 904  ****  3.64  4.03  4.04  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 650  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1090
Title        FOUNDTNS OF OPTIMIZATI        Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SHEN, JINGLAI                 Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43   780/1670  4.43  4.22  4.31  4.46  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   4   2  4.00  1199/1666  4.00  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   4   2  4.14   964/1406  4.14  4.33  4.32  4.36  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   687/1615  4.40  4.15  4.24  4.33  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   1   0   2   1   1  3.20  1428/1566  3.20  3.76  4.07  4.20  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   0   3   3  4.50   421/1528  4.50  4.14  4.12  4.33  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   194/1650  4.86  4.29  4.22  4.30  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1667  5.00  4.81  4.67  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  1   1   4   1  3.71  1282/1626  3.71  3.99  4.11  4.20  3.71


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   0   1   5  4.43   996/1559  4.43  4.53  4.46  4.49  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   1   2   3  4.00  1467/1560  4.00  4.69  4.72  4.81  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   1   0   2   3  3.71  1327/1549  3.71  4.14  4.31  4.37  3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   1   3   2  3.86  1252/1546  3.86  4.33  4.32  4.40  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1323  ****  3.71  4.00  4.03  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50  1333/1384  2.50  3.49  4.10  4.21  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50  1348/1378  2.50  3.59  4.29  4.42  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  1   0   0   0   1  3.00  1304/1378  3.00  3.61  4.31  4.51  3.00

                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 710C 0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1091
Title      CONVEXITY AND DUALITY              Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   GULER, OSMAN                       Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    4
Questionnaires:  4                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  1  1  2  4.25   996/1670  4.25  4.22  4.31  4.46  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75   312/1666  4.75  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   2   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   597/1406  4.50  4.33  4.32  4.36  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   552/1615  4.50  4.15  4.24  4.33  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   0  0  1  0  1  4.00   851/1566  4.00  3.76  4.07  4.20  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1528  5.00  4.14  4.12  4.33  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1650  5.00  4.29  4.22  4.30  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  0  2  1  4.33  1310/1667  4.33  4.81  4.67  4.74  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   403/1626  4.50  3.99  4.11  4.20  4.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75   521/1559  4.75  4.53  4.46  4.49  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1560  5.00  4.69  4.72  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  1  1  2  4.25   977/1549  4.25  4.14  4.31  4.37  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  1  0  3  4.50   715/1546  4.50  4.33  4.32  4.40  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  1318/1323  1.00  3.71  4.00  4.03  1.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  1  1  0  3.50  1103/1384  3.50  3.49  4.10  4.21  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00   970/1378  4.00  3.59  4.29  4.42  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   977/1378  4.00  3.61  4.31  4.51  4.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MATH 710D 0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1092
Title         ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETS         Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   LO, JAMES T                    Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  5                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank       Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   300/1670   4.80 4.22  4.31 4.46  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   490/1666   4.60 4.27  4.27 4.34  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   245/1615   4.80 4.15  4.24 4.33  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1566   5.00 3.76  4.07 4.20  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   560/1528   4.40 4.14  4.12 4.33  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1650   5.00 4.29  4.22 4.30  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1667   5.00 4.81  4.67 4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   637/1626   4.33 3.99  4.11 4.20  4.33


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   435/1559   4.80 4.53  4.46 4.49  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1560   5.00 4.69  4.72 4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   3   1  4.00  1146/1549   4.00 4.14  4.31 4.37  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   0   4  4.60   595/1546   4.60 4.33  4.32 4.40  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   0   1   3   1  4.00   692/1323   4.00 3.71  4.00 4.03  4.00


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   3   0  3.75   996/1384   3.75 3.49  4.10 4.21  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   0   3   1  4.25   860/1378   4.25 3.59  4.29 4.42  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0   0   0   3   1  4.25   867/1378   4.25 3.61  4.31 4.51  4.25


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 232   **** 4.00  4.19 4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/ 239   5.00 4.67  4.21 4.53  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 230   **** 5.00  4.44 4.69  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  87   **** 5.00  4.65 4.61  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79   **** ****  4.64 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  75   **** ****  4.57 4.66  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79   **** 5.00  4.45 4.58  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  80   **** 3.00  3.97 4.32  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  41   **** ****  4.50 4.65  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  38   **** ****  4.19 4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38   **** ****  4.62 4.65  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39   **** ****  4.27 4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  31   **** ****  4.47 4.59  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  28   **** ****  4.64 4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  16   **** ****  4.67 4.60  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  27   **** ****  4.54 4.67  ****
```

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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