Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 28
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Campbell,Robert		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	5	2	1	2.53	1444/1449	3.31	4.32	4.33	4.14	2.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	4	2	3.27	1386/1446	3.80	4.25	4.29	4.20	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	936/1256	4.25	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	1302/1402	3.88	4.24	4.27	4.10	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1284/1358	3.40	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	1	3	2.80	1299/1327	2.80	4.20	4.16	3.92	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	6	3	3.53	1256/1435	3.98	4.31	4.20	4.11	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	752/1446	4.81	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1364/1437	3.59	4.00	4.12	4.04	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	1299/1386	4.15	4.48	4.48	4.40	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	659/1390	4.85	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	5	3	1	2	2.69	1361/1379	3.55	4.17	4.34	4.28	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	3	1	2	2.69	1358/1379	3.60	4.25	4.36	4.26	2.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	6	2	1	3.09	1136/1236	3.09	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1033/1121	3.71	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1032/1122	4.10	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1013/1121	4.13	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	781/790	2.40	3.72	4.06	3.89	2.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	28
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Campbell,Robert				

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 100 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Intro To Contemp Math		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Kogan,Jacob		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1059/1449	3.31	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	776/1446	3.80	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	519/1256	4.25	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	734/1402	3.88	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1092/1358	3.40	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1327	2.80	4.20	4.16	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	598/1435	3.98	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1446	4.81	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	713/1437	3.59	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	614/1386	4.15	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	710/1390	4.85	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	756/1379	3.55	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	688/1379	3.60	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	3.09	3.88	4.08	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	606/1121	3.71	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1122	4.10	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	383/1121	4.13	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/790	2.40	3.72	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 26
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math					Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob					

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 51
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	24	4.61	460/1449	4.66	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	208/1446	4.77	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	236/1256	4.85	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	1	0	25	4.81	171/1402	4.81	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	4	5	14	4.33	549/1358	4.51	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	144/1327	4.58	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	155/1435	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1446	4.64	4.80	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	261/1437	4.43	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	204/1386	4.90	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	372/1390	4.94	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	223/1379	4.78	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	25	4.76	385/1379	4.85	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	0	1	2	0	12	4.53	310/1236	4.56	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	547/1121	4.30	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	284/1122	4.52	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	372/1121	4.41	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	111/790	4.38	3.72	4.06	3.89	4.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 106 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 51
Title: Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Potharaju,Pavan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/200	4.40	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/205	4.70	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/201	4.80	4.51	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/202	4.50	4.41	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 51
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	13	Under-grad	33	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 106 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 60
Title: Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 35
Instructor: Potharaju,Pavan		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	23	4.40	733/1449	4.66	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	25	4.63	411/1446	4.77	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	27	4.69	345/1256	4.85	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	396/1402	4.81	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	0	5	4	9	3.90	939/1358	4.51	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	783/1327	4.58	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	24	4.57	411/1435	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1446	4.64	4.80	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	448/1437	4.43	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	337/1386	4.90	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	30	4.82	735/1390	4.94	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	4	26	4.59	541/1379	4.78	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	29	4.74	415/1379	4.85	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	199/1236	4.56	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	1	2	0	13	4.00	727/1121	4.30	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	2	2	13	4.26	740/1122	4.52	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	1	1	2	13	4.21	788/1121	4.41	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	14	9	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	562/790	4.38	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	60
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct					Questionnaires:	35
Instructor:	Potharaju,Pavan						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	4.40	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	4.70	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	52
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct				Questionnaires:	1
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1449	4.66	4.32	4.33	4.14	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	4.85	4.39	4.34	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.81	4.24	4.27	4.10	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.51	4.03	4.13	4.04	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1435	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.11	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1354/1446	4.64	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	868/1437	4.43	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.90	4.48	4.48	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.71	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.78	4.17	4.34	4.28	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.85	4.25	4.36	4.26	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	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	52
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct				Questionnaires:	1
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha					

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

?   0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 106 05	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 51
Title: Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 30
Instructor: Riley,Samantha		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	432/1449	4.66	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	103/1446	4.77	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	93/1256	4.85	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	179/1402	4.81	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	128/1358	4.51	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	138/1327	4.58	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	391/1435	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	16	4.55	984/1446	4.64	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	4	19	4.67	226/1437	4.43	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	220/1386	4.90	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.71	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	384/1379	4.78	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	197/1379	4.85	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	383/1236	4.56	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	359/1121	4.30	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	0	2	12	4.50	537/1122	4.52	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	770/1121	4.41	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	134/790	4.38	3.72	4.06	3.89	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 106 05				Term - Spring 2011					Enrollment: 51		
Title: Algebra & Element Funct									Questionnaires: 30		
Instructor: Riley,Samantha											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	86/200	4.40	3.89	4.28	4.19	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	39/205	4.70	4.19	4.29	4.37	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	41/201	4.80	4.51	4.51	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	106/202	4.50	4.41	4.42	4.55	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	4	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05		Term - Spring 2011				Enrollment:	51
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct						Questionnaires:	30
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha							

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 115 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 31
Title: Finite Mathematics		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	733/1449	4.40	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	440/1446	4.60	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	324/1256	4.70	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	492/1402	4.53	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	302/1358	4.58	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	591/1327	4.33	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	325/1435	4.65	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	848/1446	4.70	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	470/1437	4.40	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	498/1386	4.74	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	659/1390	4.85	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	611/1379	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	543/1379	4.63	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	607/1236	4.18	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	309/1121	4.64	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	835/1122	4.09	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	715/1121	4.36	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	425/790	4.00	3.72	4.06	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 115 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	31
Title:	Finite Mathematics					Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala						

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	8	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 132 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Math For Elem Tchrs II		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Sparr,Leroy		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	4	3	3.21	1405/1449	3.21	4.32	4.33	4.14	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1228/1446	3.77	4.25	4.29	4.20	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	619/1256	4.43	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	697/1402	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	679/1358	4.20	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1327	5.00	4.20	4.16	3.92	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	808/1435	4.21	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	776/1446	4.77	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1270/1437	3.44	4.00	4.12	4.04	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1337/1386	3.36	4.48	4.48	4.40	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	2	0	3	5	3.82	1353/1390	3.82	4.71	4.74	4.67	3.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1201/1379	3.73	4.17	4.34	4.28	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1254/1379	3.50	4.25	4.36	4.26	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	882/1236	3.80	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	931/1121	3.50	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	857/1122	4.00	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	731/1121	4.33	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	562/790	3.75	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 132 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	18
Title:	Math For Elem Tchrs II					Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Sparr,Leroy						

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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 responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	145
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics		Questionnaires:	72
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	5	12	19	31	3.96	1146/1449	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.14	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	10	21	34	4.13	988/1446	4.28	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	3	10	24	30	4.03	927/1256	4.30	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	28	2	2	12	11	16	3.86	1116/1402	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.10	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	20	6	5	10	11	17	3.57	1139/1358	3.82	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	40	4	0	9	5	11	3.66	1066/1327	3.91	4.20	4.16	3.92	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	6	9	15	36	4.13	888/1435	4.22	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	9	59	4.83	687/1446	4.77	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	5	8	5	28	8	3.48	1253/1437	3.56	4.00	4.12	4.04	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	5	5	17	37	4.24	1060/1386	4.38	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	3	1	5	8	50	4.51	1162/1390	4.54	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	7	5	14	14	26	3.71	1205/1379	4.02	4.17	4.34	4.28	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	3	11	9	38	4.09	1015/1379	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	25	6	4	7	8	13	3.47	1024/1236	3.66	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	11	8	9	12	15	3.22	1020/1121	3.40	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	13	5	8	12	17	3.27	1041/1122	3.39	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	13	4	11	11	16	3.24	1057/1121	3.35	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.24
4. Were special techniques successful	17	35	4	1	7	3	5	3.20	706/790	3.10	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 150 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 145
Title: Precalculus Mathematics		Questionnaires: 72
Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	64	4	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	4	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	3	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	4	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	68	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	68	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	68	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	145
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics				Questionnaires:	72
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	25						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	22	General	9	Under-grad	72	Non-major	72
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	10	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 150 06	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 140
Title: Precalculus Mathematics		Questionnaires: 40
Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	26	4.43	705/1449	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	27	4.43	677/1446	4.28	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	9	28	4.56	467/1256	4.30	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	2	0	1	7	21	4.45	599/1402	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	6	6	18	4.06	801/1358	3.82	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	2	0	2	8	12	4.17	739/1327	3.91	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	9	23	4.32	709/1435	4.22	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	7	30	4.71	836/1446	4.77	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	4	1	4	11	8	3.64	1181/1437	3.56	4.00	4.12	4.04	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	7	28	4.51	793/1386	4.38	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	0	5	30	4.58	1097/1390	4.54	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	9	24	4.33	832/1379	4.02	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	5	30	4.61	579/1379	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	3	3	3	4	14	3.85	852/1236	3.66	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	3	7	7	15	3.58	908/1121	3.40	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	6	1	12	6	13	3.50	1005/1122	3.39	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	2	7	9	12	3.46	1027/1121	3.35	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	6	2	8	2	6	3.00	731/790	3.10	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	2	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 06			Term - Spring 2011							Enrollment:	140
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics										Questionnaires:	40
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala											

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 151 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 137
Title: Calc & Analy Geomtry I		Questionnaires: 99
Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	6	7	13	16	55	4.10	1048/1449	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	6	7	9	23	51	4.10	1006/1446	4.16	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	5	9	24	54	4.21	819/1256	4.03	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	28	2	6	8	18	33	4.10	957/1402	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	18	5	2	23	13	33	3.88	954/1358	4.09	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	41	1	5	10	10	29	4.11	792/1327	4.24	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	6	5	7	21	56	4.22	798/1435	4.29	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	1	7	84	4.90	526/1446	4.92	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	1	5	4	13	19	32	3.95	956/1437	4.00	4.00	4.12	4.04	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	5	18	69	4.63	676/1386	4.68	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	5	5	83	4.80	804/1390	4.90	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	4	23	18	45	4.02	1050/1379	4.14	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	6	13	15	55	4.16	977/1379	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	38	8	5	14	9	19	3.47	1024/1236	3.70	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	10	4	11	16	45	3.95	765/1121	4.18	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	9	9	15	18	34	3.69	971/1122	3.91	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	10	7	14	20	35	3.73	963/1121	4.10	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	15	52	3	5	9	4	11	3.47	652/790	3.47	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	137
Questionnaires:	99

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	93	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	93	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	93	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	93	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	93	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	94	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	94	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	94	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	94	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	94	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	94	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	94	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	94	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	94	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	94	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	94	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	94	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	94	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	137
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I				Questionnaires:	99
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala					

Questions			Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	94	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	94	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	69	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	12	C	19	General	6	Under-grad	98	Non-major	98
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	10	D	6						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	17						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 151 06	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 128
Title: Calc & Analy Geomtry I		Questionnaires: 69
Instructor: Gloor,Philip J.		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	6	9	14	38	4.16	997/1449	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	14	18	31	4.06	1033/1446	4.16	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	7	14	22	21	3.68	1115/1256	4.03	4.39	4.34	4.21	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	2	2	6	11	21	4.12	947/1402	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	16	2	0	10	18	21	4.10	781/1358	4.09	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	44	0	1	5	9	9	4.08	803/1327	4.24	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	9	23	34	4.26	759/1435	4.29	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	1	66	4.96	263/1446	4.92	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	2	2	8	27	14	3.92	986/1437	4.00	4.00	4.12	4.04	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	12	48	4.62	676/1386	4.68	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	63	4.93	425/1390	4.90	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	5	9	24	26	4.02	1054/1379	4.14	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	3	10	16	32	4.06	1027/1379	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	32	2	6	8	10	8	3.47	1024/1236	3.70	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	3	0	6	9	4.17	662/1121	4.18	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	940/1122	3.91	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	1	2	3	4	8	3.89	925/1121	4.10	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	51	17	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	3.47	3.72	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	128
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I			Questionnaires:	69
Instructor:	Gloor,Philip J.				

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	55	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C	21	General	1	Under-grad	69	Non-major	67
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 151 11	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 82
Title: Calc & Analy Geomtry I		Questionnaires: 36
Instructor: Gloor,Philip J.		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	24	4.47	635/1449	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	19	4.31	808/1446	4.16	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	8	6	19	4.20	819/1256	4.03	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	3	3	6	14	4.19	868/1402	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	8	19	4.30	578/1358	4.09	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	375/1327	4.24	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	11	20	4.39	633/1435	4.29	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	473/1446	4.92	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	4	11	10	4.12	791/1437	4.00	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	389/1386	4.68	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	160/1390	4.90	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	9	19	4.39	778/1379	4.14	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	4	8	19	4.33	836/1379	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	633/1236	3.70	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	466/1121	4.18	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	770/1122	3.91	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	447/1121	4.10	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/790	3.47	3.72	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 151 11		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 82
Title: Calc & Analy Geomtry I				Questionnaires: 36
Instructor: Gloor,Philip J.				

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 188
Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II		Questionnaires: 57
Instructor: Kelly,Brian		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	17	30	4.30	868/1449	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	14	33	4.38	735/1446	4.39	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	8	17	28	4.21	812/1256	4.21	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	1	1	6	5	18	4.23	839/1402	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	29	1	4	6	4	12	3.81	1010/1358	3.86	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	34	1	2	3	5	11	4.05	825/1327	4.14	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	10	38	4.55	440/1435	4.51	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	51	4.93	421/1446	4.93	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	6	17	17	4.20	702/1437	4.35	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	13	38	4.56	745/1386	4.60	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	49	4.87	607/1390	4.87	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	6	15	33	4.44	729/1379	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	14	37	4.55	644/1379	4.52	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	2	5	9	15	15	3.78	893/1236	4.01	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	2	2	38	4.73	232/1121	4.04	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	4	11	26	4.32	708/1122	3.77	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	7	8	27	4.42	683/1121	3.83	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	14	24	3	1	3	1	11	3.84	526/790	3.44	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.84

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 188
Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II		Questionnaires: 57
Instructor: Kelly,Brian		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	57	Non-major	56
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152 06	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 175
Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II		Questionnaires: 75
Instructor: Kelly,Brian		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	10	21	41	4.32	834/1449	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	21	44	4.40	704/1446	4.39	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	5	22	40	4.21	812/1256	4.21	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	1	2	9	15	20	4.09	970/1402	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	30	3	4	8	9	21	3.91	927/1358	3.86	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	46	0	2	5	6	16	4.24	670/1327	4.14	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	8	17	48	4.48	505/1435	4.51	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	70	4.93	368/1446	4.93	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	1	2	20	32	4.51	364/1437	4.35	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	13	55	4.64	660/1386	4.60	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	6	65	4.86	633/1390	4.87	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	14	53	4.63	477/1379	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	4	12	51	4.50	688/1379	4.52	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	4	8	18	35	4.24	561/1236	4.01	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	9	9	10	13	17	3.34	989/1121	4.04	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.34
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	8	10	18	5	17	3.22	1051/1122	3.77	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	8	8	14	7	15	3.25	1056/1121	3.83	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	19	32	4	4	9	1	6	3.04	729/790	3.44	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.04

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152 06	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 175
Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II		Questionnaires: 75
Instructor: Kelly,Brian		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	70	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	71	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	71	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	73	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	73	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	73	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	73	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	73	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152 06		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 175
Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II				Questionnaires: 75
Instructor: Kelly,Brian				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	59	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	13	General	3	Under-grad	75	Non-major	72
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	15	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152H 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	15
Title:	Calc/Analy Geom II-Honrs				Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	500/1449	4.57	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1022/1446	4.07	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	619/1256	4.43	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1194/1402	3.70	4.24	4.27	4.10	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1018/1358	3.80	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	739/1327	4.17	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	585/1435	4.43	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	338/1437	4.54	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	407/1386	4.79	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	814/1379	4.36	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	800/1379	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	8	3	3.79	843/1121	3.79	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	966/1122	3.71	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	721/1121	4.36	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152H 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 15	
Title: Calc/Analy Geom II-Honrs		Questionnaires: 14	
Instructor: Gowda,Muddappa			

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 155 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 64
Title: Applied Calculus		Questionnaires: 36
Instructor: Stanwyck,Elizab		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	4.58	486/1449	4.56	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	11	23	4.56	505/1446	4.63	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	9	23	4.44	594/1256	4.59	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	468/1402	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	1	8	18	4.38	511/1358	4.13	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	385/1327	3.96	4.20	4.16	3.92	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	5	26	4.62	370/1435	4.47	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	812/1446	4.59	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	330/1437	4.58	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	2	30	4.82	354/1386	4.84	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	1	31	4.85	684/1390	4.91	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	24	4.69	410/1379	4.60	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	310/1379	4.75	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	1	0	3	1	15	4.45	383/1236	4.12	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	10	9	4.00	727/1121	3.30	3.81	4.18	3.89	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	821/1122	3.69	3.91	4.36	4.09	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	3	10	10	4.04	846/1121	3.72	4.00	4.40	4.08	4.04
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	2	1	3	9	5	3.70	579/790	3.35	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 155 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 64
Title: Applied Calculus		Questionnaires: 36
Instructor: Stanwyck,Elizab		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	1	3	4	1	4	3.31	189/200	3.08	3.89	4.28	4.19	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	171/205	3.54	4.19	4.29	4.37	3.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	111/201	4.12	4.51	4.51	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	152/202	4.07	4.41	4.42	4.55	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	81/196	4.37	4.58	4.25	4.42	4.46
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01		Term - Spring 2011								Enrollment: 64			
Title:	Applied Calculus										Questionnaires: 36			
Instructor:	Stanwyck,Elizab													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 155 04	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 30
Title: Applied Calculus		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Peercy,Bradford		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	594/1449	4.56	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	664/1446	4.63	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	467/1256	4.59	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	641/1402	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	994/1358	4.13	4.03	4.13	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1075/1327	3.96	4.20	4.16	3.92	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	2	8	4.06	938/1435	4.47	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	868/1446	4.59	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	406/1437	4.58	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	462/1386	4.84	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	372/1390	4.91	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	729/1379	4.60	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	622/1379	4.75	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	675/1236	4.12	3.88	4.08	3.93	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	986/1121	3.30	3.81	4.18	3.89	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	1005/1122	3.69	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	988/1121	3.72	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	731/790	3.35	3.72	4.06	3.89	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 155 04	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 30
Title: Applied Calculus		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Peercy,Bradford		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	197/200	3.08	3.89	4.28	4.19	2.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	194/205	3.54	4.19	4.29	4.37	3.14
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	193/201	4.12	4.51	4.51	4.57	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	179/202	4.07	4.41	4.42	4.55	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	119/196	4.37	4.58	4.25	4.42	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 04		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 30
Title:	Applied Calculus					Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 155 07	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 52
Title: Applied Calculus		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Stanwyck,Elizab		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	446/1449	4.56	4.32	4.33	4.14	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	112/1446	4.63	4.25	4.29	4.20	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	247/1256	4.59	4.39	4.34	4.21	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	627/1402	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.10	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	3	10	4.19	698/1358	4.13	4.03	4.13	4.04	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	1	2	7	3.71	1037/1327	3.96	4.20	4.16	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	247/1435	4.47	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1135/1446	4.59	4.80	4.67	4.57	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	155/1437	4.58	4.00	4.12	4.04	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	122/1386	4.84	4.48	4.48	4.40	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	319/1390	4.91	4.71	4.74	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	437/1379	4.60	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	197/1379	4.75	4.25	4.36	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	876/1236	4.12	3.88	4.08	3.93	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	5	1	2	2.53	1098/1121	3.30	3.81	4.18	3.89	2.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	2	3	1	7	3.44	1019/1122	3.69	3.91	4.36	4.09	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	5	3	4	3.50	1013/1121	3.72	4.00	4.40	4.08	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/790	3.35	3.72	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 07		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	52
Title:	Applied Calculus					Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Stanwyck,Elizab						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/200	3.08	3.89	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/205	3.54	4.19	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/201	4.12	4.51	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/202	4.07	4.41	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/196	4.37	4.58	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 07
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck,Elizab

| Term - Spring 2011 |

| Enrollment: 52 |
| Questionnaires: 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | MATH 215 1 | | Term - Spring 2011 | | | Enrollment: | 76 |

| Title: | Finite Math For Info Sci | | | | Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Instructor: | Kapoor,Jagmohan | | | | | |

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	8	11	3.93	1170/1449	3.93	4.32	4.33	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	2	7	12	3.85	1180/1446	3.85	4.25	4.29	4.27	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	11	11	4.07	907/1256	4.07	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1158/1402	3.79	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1044/1358	3.75	4.03	4.13	4.13	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	974/1327	3.83	4.20	4.16	4.12	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	5	13	3.85	1101/1435	3.85	4.31	4.20	4.17	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	707/1446	4.81	4.80	4.67	4.63	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	7	9	2	3.38	1294/1437	3.38	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	6	17	4.58	726/1386	4.58	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	1	1	9	10	4.04	1325/1390	4.04	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	4	3	12	3.96	1091/1379	3.96	4.17	4.34	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	2	4	12	3.87	1140/1379	3.87	4.25	4.36	4.37	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1063/1236	3.38	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1088/1121	2.67	3.81	4.18	4.11	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	5	0	2	1	1	2.22	1117/1122	2.22	3.91	4.36	4.34	2.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	3	1	2	1	2.67	1104/1121	2.67	4.00	4.40	4.39	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 1		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 76
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci					Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.10	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	3.19	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	3.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 1		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	76
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci				Questionnaires:	27
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan					

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Lynn,Yen-mow

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1162/1449	4.21	4.32	4.33	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1369/1446	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.27	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	5	4.20	819/1256	4.23	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	810/1402	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	658/1358	4.15	4.03	4.13	4.13	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	792/1327	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	759/1435	4.45	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.80	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	1	9	1	0	2.57	1414/1437	3.66	4.00	4.12	4.10	2.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1262/1386	4.33	4.48	4.48	4.46	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	4	4	2	3.23	1381/1390	4.48	4.71	4.74	4.76	3.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	1361/1379	3.78	4.17	4.34	4.31	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	4	2	1	2.54	1368/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	2.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1205/1236	3.15	3.88	4.08	4.16	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1121	3.10	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1122	3.81	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1121	3.46	4.00	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 37
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra				Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Lynn,Yen-mow				

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	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	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 48
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Kogan,Jacob		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	8	10	4.12	1027/1449	4.21	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	3	9	3.72	1247/1446	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.27	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	8	10	4.00	936/1256	4.23	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1022/1402	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	746/1358	4.15	4.03	4.13	4.13	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	808/1327	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	420/1435	4.45	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	473/1446	4.98	4.80	4.67	4.63	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	3	13	2	3.70	1153/1437	3.66	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	916/1386	4.33	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	872/1390	4.48	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	8	5	8	3.71	1209/1379	3.78	4.17	4.34	4.31	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	2	12	3.79	1166/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1236	3.15	3.88	4.08	4.16	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	5	0	1	3.00	1052/1121	3.10	3.81	4.18	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1021/1122	3.81	3.91	4.36	4.34	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	967/1121	3.46	4.00	4.40	4.39	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 02		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	48
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra					Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	3.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 53
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 36
Instructor: Peercy,Bradford		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	11	24	4.61	446/1449	4.21	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	354/1446	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	247/1256	4.23	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	339/1402	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	371/1358	4.15	4.03	4.13	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	662/1327	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	247/1435	4.45	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.80	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	11	17	4.55	321/1437	3.66	4.00	4.12	4.10	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	237/1386	4.33	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	319/1390	4.48	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	27	4.71	370/1379	3.78	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	26	4.57	611/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	4	4	2	14	3.96	754/1236	3.15	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1121	3.10	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1122	3.81	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1121	3.46	4.00	4.40	4.39	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.35	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 03
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	36	Non-major	31
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 04	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 46
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Lo,James T		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	1077/1449	4.21	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	797/1446	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	857/1256	4.23	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	898/1402	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	717/1358	4.15	4.03	4.13	4.13	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	847/1327	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	13	4.32	709/1435	4.45	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.80	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	8	2	3.67	1172/1437	3.66	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	3	13	4.37	963/1386	4.33	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	17	4.74	906/1390	4.48	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	1038/1379	3.78	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	4.11	1011/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1052/1236	3.15	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1023/1121	3.10	3.81	4.18	4.11	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	776/1122	3.81	3.91	4.36	4.34	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1060/1121	3.46	4.00	4.40	4.39	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 46
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Lo,James T					

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.10	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	3.19	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 05		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	46
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra				Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Potra,Florian A					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	821/1449	4.21	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1142/1446	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.27	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	936/1256	4.23	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	917/1402	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1044/1358	4.15	4.03	4.13	4.13	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	309/1327	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	655/1435	4.45	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.80	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1062/1437	3.66	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1101/1386	4.33	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	923/1390	4.48	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1201/1379	3.78	4.17	4.34	4.31	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1222/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1187/1236	3.15	3.88	4.08	4.16	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1121	3.10	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1122	3.81	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1121	3.46	4.00	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 05		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	46
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra				Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Potra,Florian A					

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	0	to be significant			
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 225 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 54
Title: Intro Differentl Equatns		Questionnaires: 42
Instructor: Minkoff,Susan E		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	13	23	4.39	745/1449	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	15	19	4.24	874/1446	4.12	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	12	22	4.32	738/1256	4.04	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	1	1	3	9	8	4.00	1022/1402	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	25	4	3	3	3	3	2.88	1321/1358	3.62	4.03	4.13	4.13	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	2	3	6	11	4.04	825/1327	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	9	12	17	4.02	959/1435	4.12	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1446	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	9	19	7	3.94	956/1437	3.56	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	11	23	4.40	929/1386	4.23	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	6	31	4.70	958/1390	4.41	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	12	10	17	4.08	1030/1379	3.66	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	8	27	4.56	622/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	2	10	6	4	3.43	1040/1236	3.53	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1121	4.17	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1122	4.00	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1121	3.83	4.00	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	37	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	3.17	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 54
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns		Questionnaires: 42
Instructor:	Minkoff,Susan E		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	42	Non-major	34
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	60
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns				Questionnaires:	39
Instructor:	Gobbert,Matthia					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	2	8	10	13	3.70	1288/1449	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.32	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	7	20	6	3.68	1265/1446	4.12	4.25	4.29	4.27	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	5	8	11	13	3.79	1064/1256	4.04	4.39	4.34	4.36	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	5	0	5	4	6	3.30	1325/1402	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	3	2	5	7	6	3.48	1183/1358	3.62	4.03	4.13	4.13	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	654/1327	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	6	9	17	3.97	997/1435	4.12	4.31	4.20	4.17	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	546/1446	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.63	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	6	3	14	10	1	2.91	1384/1437	3.56	4.00	4.12	4.10	2.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	6	11	15	4.00	1177/1386	4.23	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	4	1	8	7	16	3.83	1351/1390	4.41	4.71	4.74	4.76	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	8	9	10	4	3.00	1340/1379	3.66	4.17	4.34	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	9	7	7	7	5	2.77	1353/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	6	0	7	11	5	3.31	1086/1236	3.53	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	****/1121	4.17	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/1122	4.00	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	****/1121	3.83	4.00	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	34	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/790	3.17	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	60
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns					Questionnaires:	39
Instructor:	Gobbert,Matthia						

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	39
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns				Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	348/1449	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	397/1446	4.12	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	400/1256	4.04	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	781/1402	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1039/1358	3.62	4.03	4.13	4.13	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	500/1327	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1068/1435	4.12	4.31	4.20	4.17	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1446	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	956/1437	3.56	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	691/1386	4.23	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	710/1390	4.41	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1010/1379	3.66	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	1004/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	864/1236	3.53	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	662/1121	4.17	3.81	4.18	4.11	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	857/1122	4.00	3.91	4.36	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	940/1121	3.83	4.00	4.40	4.39	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	714/790	3.17	3.72	4.06	4.01	3.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	39
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 225 04	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Intro Differentl Equatns		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Lo,James T		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1106/1449	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	7	3	3.92	1142/1446	4.12	4.25	4.29	4.27	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1187/1256	4.04	4.39	4.34	4.36	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1022/1402	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	511/1358	3.62	4.03	4.13	4.13	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1196/1327	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.12	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	401/1435	4.12	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1446	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	5	1	3	3.45	1266/1437	3.56	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1235/1386	4.23	4.48	4.48	4.46	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	1270/1390	4.41	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	1	4	3.45	1278/1379	3.66	4.17	4.34	4.31	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1273/1379	3.73	4.25	4.36	4.37	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.53	3.88	4.08	4.16	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.10	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 225 04	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Intro Differentl Equatns		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Lo,James T		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	3.19	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	3.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 04		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	18
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns				Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Lo,James T					

					NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions																		
Self Paced																		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3		General			0		Under-grad	11		Non-major			8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0													
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0		Electives			0		**** - Means there are not enough responses						
				P	0							to be significant						
				I	0		Other			0								
				?	2													

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 251 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 58
Title: Multivariable Calculus		Questionnaires: 46
Instructor: Chin,Sang H.		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	10	13	18	3.96	1146/1449	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.32	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	8	13	13	10	3.51	1324/1446	4.34	4.25	4.29	4.27	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	5	5	11	13	3.94	984/1256	4.42	4.39	4.34	4.36	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	5	11	9	9	3.57	1247/1402	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	24	0	3	5	6	7	3.81	1018/1358	4.03	4.03	4.13	4.13	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	1	2	5	8	8	3.83	974/1327	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.12	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	7	9	11	11	6	3.00	1377/1435	4.17	4.31	4.20	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	23	18	4.31	1167/1446	4.66	4.80	4.67	4.63	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	3	18	9	7	3.41	1283/1437	4.03	4.00	4.12	4.10	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	4	14	17	9	3.64	1299/1386	4.41	4.48	4.48	4.46	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	9	34	4.71	940/1390	4.78	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	17	10	12	3.56	1249/1379	4.31	4.17	4.34	4.31	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	9	10	20	3.98	1074/1379	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.37	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	29	1	6	0	3	4	3.21	1116/1236	3.83	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1121	3.25	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1122	3.38	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1121	4.13	4.00	4.40	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 58
Title:	Multivariable Calculus		Questionnaires: 46
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.		

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	12	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Spring 2011

| Enrollment: | 47 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	309/1449	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	425/1446	4.34	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	665/1256	4.42	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	599/1402	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	371/1358	4.03	4.03	4.13	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	404/1327	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	215/1435	4.17	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	263/1446	4.66	4.80	4.67	4.63	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	735/1437	4.03	4.00	4.12	4.10	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	534/1386	4.41	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	266/1390	4.78	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	437/1379	4.31	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	13	4.29	875/1379	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.37	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	546/1236	3.83	3.88	4.08	4.16	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1121	3.25	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1122	3.38	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1121	4.13	4.00	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	47
Title:	Multivariable Calculus				Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube					

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 251 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 43
Title: Multivariable Calculus		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Shen,Jinglai		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	513/1449	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	208/1446	4.34	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	165/1256	4.42	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	599/1402	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	708/1358	4.03	4.03	4.13	4.13	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	662/1327	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	14	4.26	759/1435	4.17	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	977/1446	4.66	4.80	4.67	4.63	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	659/1437	4.03	4.00	4.12	4.10	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	270/1386	4.41	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	1106/1390	4.78	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	275/1379	4.31	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	520/1379	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.37	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	864/1236	3.83	3.88	4.08	4.16	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1012/1121	3.25	3.81	4.18	4.11	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1028/1122	3.38	3.91	4.36	4.34	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	825/1121	4.13	4.00	4.40	4.39	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 43
Title:	Multivariable Calculus					Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 30
Title:	Multivariable Calculus			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	390/1449	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	637/1446	4.34	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	519/1256	4.42	4.39	4.34	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	655/1402	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1113/1358	4.03	4.03	4.13	4.13	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	637/1327	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	325/1435	4.17	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	728/1446	4.66	4.80	4.67	4.63	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	595/1437	4.03	4.00	4.12	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	929/1386	4.41	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	531/1390	4.78	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	902/1379	4.31	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	883/1379	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.37	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	709/1236	3.83	3.88	4.08	4.16	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	3.25	3.81	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1122	3.38	3.91	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1121	4.13	4.00	4.40	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Multivariable Calculus				Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian					

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
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 responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 301 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 34
Title: Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Rathinam,Muruha		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	758/1449	4.44	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	885/1446	4.35	4.25	4.29	4.33	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	717/1256	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	849/1402	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	916/1358	4.03	4.03	4.13	4.14	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	202/1327	4.36	4.20	4.16	4.23	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	545/1435	4.45	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	9	3	3.82	1068/1437	4.01	4.00	4.12	4.14	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	803/1386	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.53	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	1162/1390	4.66	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	814/1379	4.32	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	977/1379	4.26	4.25	4.36	4.40	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/1236	3.60	3.88	4.08	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 34
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	5.00	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 34
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	31
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires:	24
Instructor:	Suri,Manil			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	594/1449	4.44	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	7	15	4.46	637/1446	4.35	4.25	4.29	4.33	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	16	4.42	631/1256	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.39	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	762/1402	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	746/1358	4.03	4.03	4.13	4.14	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	847/1327	4.36	4.20	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	14	4.46	545/1435	4.45	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	11	7	4.20	691/1437	4.01	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	516/1386	4.61	4.48	4.48	4.53	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	761/1390	4.66	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	876/1379	4.32	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	814/1379	4.26	4.25	4.36	4.40	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	1	0	5	0	4	3.60	980/1236	3.60	3.88	4.08	4.18	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 31
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I			Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Suri,Manil			

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 302 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 40
Title: Intro Math Analysis II		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Gowda,Muddappa		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	269/1449	4.76	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	149/1446	4.84	4.25	4.29	4.33	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	182/1256	4.85	4.39	4.34	4.39	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	224/1402	4.76	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	0	4	4	8	3.89	954/1358	3.89	4.03	4.13	4.14	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	158/1327	4.79	4.20	4.16	4.23	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	215/1435	4.76	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	19	4.58	970/1446	4.58	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	61/1437	4.93	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	82/1386	4.97	4.48	4.48	4.53	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	372/1390	4.94	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	175/1379	4.86	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.25	4.36	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	77/1236	4.91	3.88	4.08	4.18	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 302 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	40
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II				Questionnaires:	33
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.18	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	2	Major	25
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 306 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 6
Title: Geometry		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor: Ehrhardt,Kriste		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	821/1449	4.33	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.25	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.39	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	679/1358	4.20	4.03	4.13	4.14	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	992/1327	3.80	4.20	4.16	4.23	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	687/1435	4.33	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1408/1446	3.83	4.80	4.67	4.68	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1090/1386	4.20	4.48	4.48	4.53	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1058/1379	4.00	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	943/1379	4.20	4.25	4.36	4.40	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	****	3.88	4.08	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	547/1121	4.33	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1122	5.00	3.91	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.00	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 306 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	6
Title:	Geometry				Questionnaires:	6
Instructor:	Ehrhardt,Kriste					

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 341 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 21
Title:	Computational Methods			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Suri,Manil			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	719/1449	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	690/1446	4.42	4.25	4.29	4.33	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	367/1256	4.67	4.39	4.34	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	962/1358	3.88	4.03	4.13	4.14	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	756/1327	4.14	4.20	4.16	4.23	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	769/1435	4.25	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	473/1446	4.92	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	803/1437	4.10	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.48	4.48	4.53	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1162/1390	4.50	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	832/1379	4.33	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	776/1379	4.42	4.25	4.36	4.40	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	823/1236	3.91	3.88	4.08	4.18	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	4.37	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 341 01
Title:	Computational Methods
Instructor:	Suri,Manil

Term - Spring 2011	

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	12

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 385 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 37
Title: Intro To Math Modeling		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Kang,Weining		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	7	10	4	3.63	1320/1449	3.63	4.32	4.33	4.38	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	918/1446	4.20	4.25	4.29	4.33	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	784/1256	4.25	4.39	4.34	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	917/1402	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1246/1358	3.29	4.03	4.13	4.14	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	933/1327	3.91	4.20	4.16	4.23	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	848/1435	4.17	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	606/1446	4.86	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	7	8	2	3.53	1236/1437	3.53	4.00	4.12	4.14	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	937/1386	4.39	4.48	4.48	4.53	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	1223/1390	4.41	4.71	4.74	4.76	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	1042/1379	4.05	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	4	9	3.82	1159/1379	3.82	4.25	4.36	4.40	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1078/1236	3.33	3.88	4.08	4.18	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 385 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	37
Title:	Intro To Math Modeling				Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Kang,Weining					

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 390 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	12
Title:	Special Topics In Math			Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Zweck,John W				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	432/1449	4.63	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	411/1446	4.63	4.25	4.29	4.33	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1256	4.75	4.39	4.34	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	408/1402	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	549/1358	4.33	4.03	4.13	4.14	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	704/1327	4.20	4.20	4.16	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	898/1435	4.13	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	586/1446	4.88	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	88/1437	4.88	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1386	4.88	4.48	4.48	4.53	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1379	4.75	4.17	4.34	4.38	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	211/1379	4.88	4.25	4.36	4.40	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	331/1236	4.50	3.88	4.08	4.18	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 390 01
Title:	Special Topics In Math
Instructor:	Zweck,John W

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	8

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

Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3

F   0   Electives   4   **** - Means there are not enough responses

P   0   to be significant

I   0   Other   0

?   1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 404 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 28
Title: Intro Part Diff Eq I		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Bell,Jonathan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	258/1449	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	885/1446	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	519/1256	4.22	4.39	4.34	4.43	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1022/1402	3.55	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	511/1358	3.55	4.03	4.13	4.21	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	704/1327	3.75	4.20	4.16	4.28	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	633/1435	4.19	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	868/1437	3.65	4.00	4.12	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	183/1386	4.63	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	872/1390	4.73	4.71	4.74	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1058/1379	3.82	4.17	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	0	7	3.92	1117/1379	3.90	4.25	4.36	4.44	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	709/1236	3.42	3.88	4.08	4.13	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01			Term - Spring 2011				Enrollment:	28
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I							Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan								

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 404 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 30
Title: Intro Part Diff Eq I		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Minkoff,Susan E		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	920/1449	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1228/1446	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.34	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	984/1256	4.22	4.39	4.34	4.43	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	6	3	0	3.09	1354/1402	3.55	4.24	4.27	4.35	3.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	1	3	0	3	2.73	1334/1358	3.55	4.03	4.13	4.21	2.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1208/1327	3.75	4.20	4.16	4.28	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	970/1435	4.19	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	1	9	0	3.31	1322/1437	3.65	4.00	4.12	4.20	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	972/1386	4.63	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	958/1390	4.73	4.71	4.74	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	1226/1379	3.82	4.17	4.34	4.40	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1132/1379	3.90	4.25	4.36	4.44	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1176/1236	3.42	3.88	4.08	4.13	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 404 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 30
Title: Intro Part Diff Eq I		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Minkoff,Susan E		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/200	****	3.89	4.28	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	4	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 407 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	15
Title:	Modern Algebra & No.Theo					Questionnaires:	5
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma						

Questions	NR	NA	_Frequencies_ 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	218/1449	4.80	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	918/1446	4.20	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	644/1256	4.40	4.39	4.34	4.43	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	810/1402	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.03	4.13	4.21	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	253/1327	4.67	4.20	4.16	4.28	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	818/1435	4.20	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1082/1437	3.80	4.00	4.12	4.20	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	929/1386	4.40	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1070/1390	4.60	4.71	4.74	4.78	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	946/1379	4.20	4.17	4.34	4.40	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	786/1379	4.40	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Run Date: 7/14/2011 12:13:47 PM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	5

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 408 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 4
Title: Intro Abstract Algebra		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	903/1449	4.25	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	863/1446	4.25	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.39	4.34	4.43	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	163/1358	4.75	4.03	4.13	4.21	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	253/1327	4.67	4.20	4.16	4.28	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	687/1435	4.33	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	788/1446	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1419/1437	2.50	4.00	4.12	4.20	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1052/1386	4.25	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	872/1390	4.75	4.71	4.74	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	902/1379	4.25	4.17	4.34	4.40	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	900/1379	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.88	4.08	4.13	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.81	4.18	4.39	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	5.00	3.91	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.00	4.40	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/790	5.00	3.72	4.06	4.27	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | MATH 408 01 | | Term - Spring 2011 | | | Enrollment: | 4 |

| Title: | Intro Abstract Algebra | | | | Questionnaires: | 4 |

| Instructor: | Armstrong,Thoma | |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/200	5.00	3.89	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/205	5.00	4.19	4.29	3.91	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/201	5.00	4.51	4.51	4.19	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.41	4.42	3.90	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/196	5.00	4.58	4.25	3.43	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/67	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.47	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.88	4.36	4.33	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/64	5.00	4.88	4.25	4.24	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/75	5.00	4.83	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.09	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/34	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.42	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/35	5.00	5.00	4.15	4.16	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.08	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.96	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/27	5.00	5.00	4.13	4.20	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/31	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.17	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/18	5.00	5.00	4.13	4.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/24	5.00	5.00	4.34	3.98	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 408 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 4
Title:	Intro Abstract Algebra				Questionnaires: 4
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/15	5.00	5.00	4.18	3.94	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/13	5.00	5.00	4.07	3.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 411 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	18
Title:	Linear Algebra					Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Potra,Florian A						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1202/1449	3.88	4.32	4.33	4.46	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	863/1446	4.25	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	675/1256	4.38	4.39	4.34	4.43	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1149/1402	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.35	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	371/1358	4.50	4.03	4.13	4.21	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	500/1327	4.43	4.20	4.16	4.28	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	107/1435	4.88	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	868/1437	4.00	4.00	4.12	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	614/1386	4.67	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1058/1379	4.00	4.17	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.88	4.08	4.13	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	396/1121	4.50	3.81	4.18	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	537/1122	4.50	3.91	4.36	4.54	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	855/1121	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.60	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	643/790	3.50	3.72	4.06	4.27	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 411 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	18
Title:	Linear Algebra			Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Potra,Florian A				

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 413 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 9
Title: Number Theory		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Toll,Charles		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1449	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1446	4.89	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	149/1256	4.89	4.39	4.34	4.43	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1402	4.88	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	628/1358	4.25	4.03	4.13	4.21	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1327	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.28	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	194/1435	4.78	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	566/1446	4.89	4.80	4.67	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	84/1437	4.89	4.00	4.12	4.20	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	462/1386	4.75	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.17	4.34	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.25	4.36	4.44	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1012/1236	3.50	3.88	4.08	4.13	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	283/1121	4.67	3.81	4.18	4.39	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	691/1122	4.33	3.91	4.36	4.54	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.00	4.40	4.60	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 413 01
Title:	Number Theory
Instructor:	Toll,Charles

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.41	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.58	4.25	3.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 413 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 9
Title:	Number Theory		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor:	Toll,Charles		

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

28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives 3
				P	0	
				I	0	Other 1
				?	0	

Under-grad 9   Non-major 4

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 430 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 35
Title: Matrix Analysis		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Shen,Jinglai		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	513/1449	4.57	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	411/1446	4.63	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.39	4.34	4.43	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	456/1402	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	404/1358	4.47	4.03	4.13	4.21	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	235/1327	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.28	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	115/1435	4.87	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.96	4.80	4.67	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	493/1437	4.38	4.00	4.12	4.20	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	516/1386	4.73	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	1162/1390	4.50	4.71	4.74	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	5	15	4.50	635/1379	4.50	4.17	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	430/1379	4.73	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	****	3.88	4.08	4.13	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	3.91	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.16	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.34	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 432 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title: History Of Mathematics		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Seidman,Thomas		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	3	0	2.78	1430/1449	2.78	4.32	4.33	4.46	2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	1	0	0	1.78	1446/1446	1.78	4.25	4.29	4.34	1.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1256	****	4.39	4.34	4.43	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	1	2	0	2.11	1402/1402	2.11	4.24	4.27	4.35	2.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	1	2	0	2.11	1353/1358	2.11	4.03	4.13	4.21	2.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	1	1	0	1.88	1326/1327	1.88	4.20	4.16	4.28	1.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	1.22	1435/1435	1.22	4.31	4.20	4.27	1.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	984/1446	4.56	4.80	4.67	4.71	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	5	2	0	0	2.13	1434/1437	2.13	4.00	4.12	4.20	2.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	3	0	0	2.00	1384/1386	2.00	4.48	4.48	4.55	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	1267/1390	4.29	4.71	4.74	4.78	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	4	0	0	2.29	1376/1379	2.29	4.17	4.34	4.40	2.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	1370/1379	2.50	4.25	4.36	4.44	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1218/1236	2.33	3.88	4.08	4.13	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1113/1121	2.25	3.81	4.18	4.39	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1110/1122	2.50	3.91	4.36	4.54	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1119/1121	2.25	4.00	4.40	4.60	2.25
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 432 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title: History Of Mathematics		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Seidman,Thomas		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/205	****	4.19	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/201	****	4.51	4.51	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.88	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/64	****	4.88	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.83	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.42	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	5.00	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.16	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.04	3.96	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 432 01		Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title: History Of Mathematics			Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Seidman,Thomas			

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

? 0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 479 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 14
Title: Math Problem Solving Sem		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1106/1449	4.00	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1256	4.67	4.39	4.34	4.43	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1402	4.71	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	285/1358	4.60	4.03	4.13	4.21	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	553/1327	4.38	4.20	4.16	4.28	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	479/1435	4.50	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	526/1446	4.91	4.80	4.67	4.71	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	691/1437	4.20	4.00	4.12	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	462/1386	4.75	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.17	4.34	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	385/1379	4.75	4.25	4.36	4.44	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	220/1236	4.67	3.88	4.08	4.13	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/66	4.75	4.88	4.36	4.33	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/64	4.75	4.88	4.25	4.24	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	27/75	4.67	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	47/73	3.83	4.42	4.00	4.09	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 479 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	14
Title:	Math Problem Solving Sem					Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma						

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 486 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 8
Title: Intro To Dynamical Sys		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Hoffman,Kathlee		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1449	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	140/1446	4.86	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	174/1256	4.86	4.39	4.34	4.43	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	679/1358	4.20	4.03	4.13	4.21	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	337/1327	4.57	4.20	4.16	4.28	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	585/1435	4.43	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	836/1446	4.71	4.80	4.67	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	184/1437	4.71	4.00	4.12	4.20	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	287/1386	4.86	4.48	4.48	4.55	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	876/1379	4.29	4.17	4.34	4.40	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.25	4.36	4.44	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	****	3.88	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 486 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 8
Title:	Intro To Dynamical Sys				Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee				

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

Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses
				P	0			to be significant
				I	0	Other	0	
				?	0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 603 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 4
Title: Matrix Analysis		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Seidman,Thomas		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1304/1449	3.67	4.32	4.33	4.41	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1411/1446	3.00	4.25	4.29	4.30	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1123/1256	3.67	4.39	4.34	4.30	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1398/1402	2.33	4.24	4.27	4.26	2.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1350/1358	2.33	4.03	4.13	4.18	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1264/1327	3.00	4.20	4.16	4.29	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1406/1435	2.67	4.31	4.20	4.23	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	888/1446	4.67	4.80	4.67	4.81	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1364/1437	3.00	4.00	4.12	4.17	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1296/1386	3.67	4.48	4.48	4.47	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1250/1390	4.33	4.71	4.74	4.77	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1340/1379	3.00	4.17	4.34	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1334/1379	3.00	4.25	4.36	4.35	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	931/1121	3.50	3.81	4.18	4.29	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	857/1122	4.00	3.91	4.36	4.44	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1121	4.50	4.00	4.40	4.52	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 603 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	3

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

28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0

General   0   Under-grad   2   Non-major   0

Electives   0   **** - Means there are not enough responses
                                          to be significant

Other   0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 612 01	Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 17
Title:	Ordinary Differential Eq				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	486/1449	4.59	4.32	4.33	4.41	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	756/1446	4.35	4.25	4.29	4.30	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	1108/1256	3.71	4.39	4.34	4.30	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	849/1402	4.21	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	679/1358	4.20	4.03	4.13	4.18	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	309/1327	4.60	4.20	4.16	4.29	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	401/1435	4.59	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1310/1446	4.12	4.80	4.67	4.81	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	680/1437	4.21	4.00	4.12	4.17	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	1067/1386	4.24	4.48	4.48	4.47	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	1088/1390	4.59	4.71	4.74	4.77	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1038/1379	4.06	4.17	4.34	4.34	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	666/1379	4.53	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1236	****	3.88	4.08	3.94	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.29	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.44	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.52	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	****	3.72	4.06	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 612 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	17
Title:	Ordinary Differential Eq		Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha			

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	8	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 625 01		Term - Spring 2011				Enrollment: 3
Title:	Comp Math & C Prog						Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1449	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.03	4.13	4.18	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1327	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	687/1435	4.33	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1437	5.00	4.00	4.12	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.48	4.48	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.17	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.25	4.36	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.88	4.08	3.94	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.81	4.18	4.29	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	5.00	3.91	4.36	4.44	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.00	4.40	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/790	5.00	3.72	4.06	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 625 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	3
Title:	Comp Math & C Prog				Questionnaires:	3
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube					

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

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 627 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 9
Title: Intr Parallel Comp		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor: Gobbert,Matthia		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1449	4.83	4.32	4.33	4.41	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	158/1446	4.83	4.25	4.29	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.39	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1402	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	285/1358	4.60	4.03	4.13	4.18	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1327	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	163/1435	4.80	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1437	5.00	4.00	4.12	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	614/1386	4.67	4.48	4.48	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	518/1379	4.60	4.17	4.34	4.34	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.25	4.36	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.88	4.08	3.94	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	727/1121	4.00	3.81	4.18	4.29	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	857/1122	4.00	3.91	4.36	4.44	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.00	4.40	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 627 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 9
Title:	Intr Parallel Comp		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor:	Gobbert,Matthia		

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 630 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 5
Title: Numerical Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Draganescu,Andr		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1449	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	918/1446	4.20	4.25	4.29	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	936/1256	4.00	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	483/1358	4.40	4.03	4.13	4.18	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1327	4.75	4.20	4.16	4.29	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1435	5.00	4.31	4.20	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	691/1437	4.20	4.00	4.12	4.17	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	707/1386	4.60	4.48	4.48	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.71	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	902/1379	4.25	4.17	4.34	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	900/1379	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	127/1236	4.80	3.88	4.08	3.94	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1052/1121	3.00	3.81	4.18	4.29	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1082/1122	3.00	3.91	4.36	4.44	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1111/1121	2.50	4.00	4.40	4.52	2.50

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 630 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 5
Title:	Numerical Linear Algebra			Questionnaires: 5
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr			

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 651 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 10
Title: Optimization Algorithms		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Guler,Osman		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	527/1449	4.56	4.32	4.33	4.41	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	505/1446	4.56	4.25	4.29	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.39	4.34	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	444/1402	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	827/1358	4.00	4.03	4.13	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	180/1327	4.75	4.20	4.16	4.29	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	194/1435	4.78	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	984/1446	4.56	4.80	4.67	4.81	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	606/1437	4.29	4.00	4.12	4.17	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	462/1386	4.75	4.48	4.48	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	872/1390	4.75	4.71	4.74	4.77	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1003/1379	4.13	4.17	4.34	4.34	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	688/1379	4.50	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	624/1236	4.17	3.88	4.08	3.94	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1121	****	3.81	4.18	4.29	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1122	****	3.91	4.36	4.44	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	4.00	4.40	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 651 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	10
Title:	Optimization Algorithms				Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Guler,Osman					

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

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