Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment:	30			
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math									Questionnaires:	14			
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob													

			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	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	1432/1542	3.00	4.25	4.33	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	3	3	3.29	1466/1542	3.17	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	911/1339	3.71	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1239/1498	3.28	4.09	4.26	4.08	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	851/1428	3.32	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1080/1407	3.48	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1046/1521	3.77	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	1353/1541	4.61	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	4	3	1	3.18	1393/1518	3.06	3.93	4.11	4.00	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1340/1472	3.63	4.41	4.46	4.38	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1397/1475	4.19	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1405/1471	2.97	4.12	4.32	4.23	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1257/1470	3.44	4.22	4.33	4.21	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1310	3.21	3.72	4.06	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	0	3	0	2.43	1195/1210	2.78	3.58	4.18	3.91	2.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	863/1211	3.88	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1122/1207	3.61	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.64	3.43	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	30
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math										Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob											

				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	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 30
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math			Questionnaires: 22
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	3	9	7	2	1	2.50	1536/1542	3.00	4.25	4.33	4.18	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	6	7	2	3.05	1499/1542	3.17	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	4	2	8	3.27	1268/1339	3.71	4.25	4.32	4.14	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	3	4	5	3	2.81	1477/1498	3.28	4.09	4.26	4.08	2.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	6	4	3	3	3	2.63	1405/1428	3.32	3.90	4.12	3.98	2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	2	3	4	6	3.20	1309/1407	3.48	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	4	5	7	3.55	1313/1521	3.77	4.28	4.20	4.09	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1541	4.61	4.81	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	6	6	5	1	2.95	1438/1518	3.06	3.93	4.11	4.00	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	6	7	5	3.50	1399/1472	3.63	4.41	4.46	4.38	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	1280/1475	4.19	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	9	4	2	4	2.86	1434/1471	2.97	4.12	4.32	4.23	2.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	10	3	4	3.19	1386/1470	3.44	4.22	4.33	4.21	3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	2	8	4	3	3.21	1180/1310	3.21	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	5	3	3	3.13	1116/1210	2.78	3.58	4.18	3.91	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1076/1211	3.88	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	1021/1207	3.61	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	662/859	3.64	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 100 02		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 30			
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math											Questionnaires: 22			
Instructor:	Suri,Manil														

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	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	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 100 02	**Term - Spring 2012**	**Enrollment: 30**
Title: Intro To Contemp Math		**Questionnaires: 22**
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	17	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	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 106 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 54	
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct					Questionnaires: 25	
Instructor:	Webb,Deborah P.						

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	0	3	9	12	4.24	973/1542	4.48	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	12	4.24	942/1542	4.57	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	14	4.44	649/1339	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	688/1498	4.24	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	851/1428	4.17	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	2	0	6	5	3.86	1013/1407	4.39	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	14	4.40	658/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	721/1541	4.58	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	12	4	4.11	832/1518	4.32	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	4	15	4.28	1065/1472	4.57	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	1181/1475	4.77	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	6	12	4.08	1070/1471	4.51	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	10	13	4.32	897/1470	4.57	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	2	5	4	7	3.60	1020/1310	3.79	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	854/1210	4.48	3.58	4.18	3.91	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1050/1211	4.29	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	993/1207	4.28	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	713/859	4.09	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 54
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct			Questionnaires: 25
Instructor:	Webb,Deborah P.			

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	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	5.00	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	4.90	4.58	4.17	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 59				
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct							Questionnaires: 34				
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	9	18	4.29	918/1542	4.48	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	242/1542	4.57	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	434/1339	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	618/1498	4.24	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	3	1	3	2	9	3.72	1119/1428	4.17	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	728/1407	4.39	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	23	4.59	430/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	413/1541	4.58	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	4	12	7	4.13	812/1518	4.32	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	31	4.85	288/1472	4.57	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	323/1475	4.77	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	10	22	4.53	617/1471	4.51	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	528/1470	4.57	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	863/1310	3.79	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	504/1210	4.48	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	739/1211	4.29	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	676/1207	4.28	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	****/859	4.09	3.43	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 59
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct			Questionnaires: 34
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	5.00	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/210	4.90	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/202	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	5.00	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	12	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 106 03	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 38
Title: Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 15
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	435/1542	4.48	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	101/1542	4.57	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	254/1339	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	174/1498	4.24	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	327/1428	4.17	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	4.39	4.12	4.15	3.92	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	408/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1208/1541	4.58	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	181/1518	4.32	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	146/1472	4.57	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	646/1475	4.77	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	114/1471	4.51	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1470	4.57	4.22	4.33	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	761/1310	3.79	3.72	4.06	3.93	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	129/1210	4.48	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	327/1211	4.29	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	379/1207	4.28	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	250/859	4.09	3.43	4.08	3.95	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 38	
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct					Questionnaires: 15	
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	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.34	4.12	3.92	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/210	4.90	4.58	4.17	4.14	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	5.00	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 38
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha		

				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	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	12
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct				Questionnaires:	2
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1542	4.48	4.25	4.33	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1542	4.57	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	582/1339	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1346/1498	4.24	4.09	4.26	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1124/1541	4.58	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1518	4.32	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1222/1472	4.57	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1475	4.77	4.67	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1471	4.51	4.12	4.32	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1470	4.57	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 50			
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct								Questionnaires: 10			
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1017/1542	4.48	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	754/1542	4.57	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	757/1339	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1058/1498	4.24	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	494/1428	4.17	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	405/1407	4.39	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	1046/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1360/1541	4.58	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	842/1518	4.32	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	367/1472	4.57	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1197/1475	4.77	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	1104/1471	4.51	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	844/1470	4.57	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	991/1310	3.79	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1210	4.48	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	739/1211	4.29	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	918/1207	4.28	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	315/859	4.09	3.43	4.08	3.95	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 50
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct			Questionnaires: 10
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.34	4.12	3.92	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/210	4.90	4.58	4.17	4.14	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/199	5.00	4.40	4.15	4.14	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05	Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 50
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct				Questionnaires: 10
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														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 132 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 22
Title:	Math For Elem Tchrs II					Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J					

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	3	11	4.67	435/1542	4.67	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	229/1542	4.80	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	252/1498	4.75	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	452/1428	4.44	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1407	4.80	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	185/1521	4.80	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1321/1541	4.27	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	199/1518	4.73	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1472	4.75	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	484/1475	4.92	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	463/1471	4.67	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	374/1470	4.75	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1301/1310	2.00	3.72	4.06	3.93	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 132 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 22
Title:	Math For Elem Tchrs II		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J		

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 150 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 129
Title: Precalculus Mathematics		Questionnaires: 57
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	1	2	6	18	29	4.29	929/1542	4.42	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	8	15	28	4.20	992/1542	4.47	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	18	27	4.18	888/1339	4.35	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	2	3	7	14	19	4.00	1058/1498	4.24	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	5	14	15	7	3.52	1223/1428	3.89	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	2	5	16	12	4.09	837/1407	4.28	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	3	12	34	4.33	759/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	50	4.91	689/1541	4.95	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	4	7	18	10	3.87	1078/1518	4.22	3.93	4.11	4.00	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	10	41	4.64	644/1472	4.77	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	48	4.82	781/1475	4.90	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	14	11	25	4.02	1099/1471	4.37	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	15	32	4.39	834/1470	4.63	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	18	4	2	5	6	15	3.81	917/1310	4.15	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	6	11	26	4.10	741/1210	3.92	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	3	6	11	25	4.02	911/1211	3.80	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	2	9	16	20	4.02	912/1207	3.93	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.02
4. Were special techniques successful	8	17	4	2	11	6	9	3.44	735/859	3.39	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 129			
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics										Questionnaires: 57			
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	52	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	129
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics					Questionnaires:	57
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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		**Cum. GPA**		**Expected Grades**		**Reasons**		**Type**		**Majors**	
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	10	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 150 06		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 147
Title: Precalculus Mathematics				Questionnaires: 78
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	0	8	15	54	4.55	572/1542	4.42	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	63	4.73	324/1542	4.47	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	20	51	4.53	560/1339	4.35	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	33	0	0	6	11	28	4.49	576/1498	4.24	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	35	2	1	6	8	25	4.26	619/1428	3.89	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	48	0	2	2	6	20	4.47	455/1407	4.28	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	17	52	4.51	507/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	77	5.00	1/1541	4.95	4.81	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	1	0	0	22	38	4.57	318/1518	4.22	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	72	4.91	209/1472	4.77	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	76	4.97	162/1475	4.90	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	13	57	4.72	399/1471	4.37	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	70	4.87	217/1470	4.63	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	2	0	6	13	44	4.49	334/1310	4.15	3.72	4.06	3.93	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	8	3	13	7	28	3.75	929/1210	3.92	3.58	4.18	3.91	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	9	7	7	11	24	3.59	1084/1211	3.80	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	7	4	10	7	30	3.84	1007/1207	3.93	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	21	37	4	2	5	1	8	3.35	763/859	3.39	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 150 06	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 147
Title: Precalculus Mathematics		Questionnaires: 78
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	74	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	74	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	74	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	76	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 150 06	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	147
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics		Questionnaires:	78
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
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	56	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	24	General	9	Under-grad	78	Non-major	78
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	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	2				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment:	123		
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I									Questionnaires:	70		
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J												

			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	0	3	5	17	45	4.49	661/1542	4.42	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	13	52	4.64	441/1542	4.39	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	1	10	53	4.53	560/1339	4.31	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	2	2	4	14	26	4.25	854/1498	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	25	6	3	9	13	13	3.55	1215/1428	3.80	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	38	3	1	1	14	12	4.00	874/1407	4.03	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	10	24	34	4.32	772/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	1	2	63	4.85	771/1541	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	3	19	35	4.56	326/1518	4.25	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	10	54	4.76	435/1472	4.72	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	61	4.90	565/1475	4.88	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	4	13	49	4.63	513/1471	4.37	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	11	53	4.68	483/1470	4.49	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	3	4	6	7	28	4.10	706/1310	3.66	3.72	4.06	3.93	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	8	5	12	14	18	3.51	1007/1210	4.12	3.58	4.18	3.91	3.51
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	8	6	12	16	15	3.42	1120/1211	3.88	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	8	6	11	12	20	3.53	1092/1207	4.09	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	14	31	2	4	6	5	8	3.52	706/859	3.66	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 123
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I		Questionnaires: 70
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J		

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	65	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	66	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	2	B	20						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	19	General	5	Under-grad	70	Non-major	70
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	2	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment:	104			
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I									Questionnaires:	56			
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M													

			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	0	2	8	15	31	4.34	869/1542	4.42	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	9	16	28	4.20	1000/1542	4.39	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	7	13	12	22	3.85	1082/1339	4.31	4.25	4.32	4.14	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	4	7	10	15	3.84	1193/1498	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.08	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	1	10	13	13	3.95	931/1428	3.80	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	2	6	11	7	3.88	989/1407	4.03	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	15	33	4.43	630/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	5.00	1/1541	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	0	9	21	15	4.00	920/1518	4.25	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	11	43	4.71	520/1472	4.72	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	49	4.89	565/1475	4.88	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	5	21	26	4.20	992/1471	4.37	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	19	31	4.30	918/1470	4.49	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	36	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	822/1310	3.66	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	3	15	30	4.37	546/1210	4.12	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	4	6	17	22	4.04	908/1211	3.88	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	6	16	27	4.31	783/1207	4.09	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	4	27	5	5	1	9	5	3.16	803/859	3.66	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	104
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I			Questionnaires:	56
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M				

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	51	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	26						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	9	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	56	Non-major	56
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	2	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 151 11			Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 81				
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I									Questionnaires: 42				
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M													

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	0	17	23	4.43	750/1542	4.42	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	11	23	4.34	821/1542	4.39	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	9	28	4.56	518/1339	4.31	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	6	10	16	4.21	895/1498	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	1	8	6	13	3.90	985/1428	3.80	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	0	4	6	12	4.22	728/1407	4.03	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	5	9	25	4.51	507/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.98	207/1541	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	1	2	1	12	14	4.20	744/1518	4.25	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	31	4.68	568/1472	4.72	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	38	4.85	673/1475	4.88	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	8	25	4.29	914/1471	4.37	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	9	25	4.49	716/1470	4.49	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	24	4	2	3	1	4	2.93	1240/1310	3.66	3.72	4.06	3.93	2.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	8	25	4.47	457/1210	4.12	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	3	8	6	21	4.18	840/1211	3.88	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	7	7	23	4.43	694/1207	4.09	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	1	4	7	18	4.29	339/859	3.66	3.43	4.08	3.95	4.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 81				
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I									Questionnaires: 42				
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11		Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment: 81
Title:	**Calc & Analy Geomtry I**						**Questionnaires: 42**
Instructor:	**Nanes,Kalman M**						

Questions	NR	NA	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	39	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	42	Non-major	40
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment:	131
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II									Questionnaires:	92
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J										

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	14	73	4.72	372/1542	4.25	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	83	4.88	161/1542	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	14	77	4.83	234/1339	4.21	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	36	0	0	1	19	35	4.62	416/1498	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	29	5	13	11	14	20	3.49	1234/1428	3.73	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	58	0	2	5	6	21	4.35	579/1407	4.08	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	19	69	4.73	259/1521	4.38	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	89	4.99	138/1541	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	0	9	66	4.83	142/1518	3.89	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	83	4.90	209/1472	4.34	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	87	4.95	323/1475	4.64	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	18	70	4.72	399/1471	4.05	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	80	4.86	244/1470	4.19	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	29	3	2	5	11	38	4.34	495/1310	3.63	3.72	4.06	3.93	4.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	12	5	21	16	28	3.52	1003/1210	3.59	3.58	4.18	3.91	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	5	6	23	17	30	3.75	1041/1211	3.55	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	9	6	15	20	28	3.67	1063/1207	3.79	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	14	58	2	1	3	6	8	3.85	****/859	3.18	3.43	4.08	3.95	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	131
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II			Questionnaires:	92
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J				

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	88	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	89	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	89	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	89	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	89	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	22	0.00-0.99	1	A	44	Required for Majors	77	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	29	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	16	General	6	Under-grad	92	Non-major	87
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	40	F	1	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 152 06	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 116
Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II		Questionnaires: 44
Instructor: Glezen,John		

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	5	15	22	4.33	882/1542	4.25	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	18	20	4.23	954/1542	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	9	13	18	4.12	935/1339	4.21	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	2	3	14	12	4.16	946/1498	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.08	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	0	1	8	7	12	4.07	809/1428	3.73	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	629/1407	4.08	4.12	4.15	3.92	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	12	24	4.40	658/1521	4.38	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	689/1541	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	1	1	9	14	7	3.78	1141/1518	3.89	3.93	4.11	4.00	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	16	21	4.28	1072/1472	4.34	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	42	4.98	162/1475	4.64	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	20	14	4.05	1087/1471	4.05	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	12	24	4.35	876/1470	4.19	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	21	2	4	7	5	5	3.30	1153/1310	3.63	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	7	7	9	9	3.10	1119/1210	3.59	3.58	4.18	3.91	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	7	6	9	7	11	3.23	1148/1211	3.55	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	4	12	8	15	3.73	1044/1207	3.79	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	26	4	1	1	2	5	3.23	792/859	3.18	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152 06		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 116			
Title: Calc & Analy Geometry II										Questionnaires: 44			
Instructor: Glezen,John													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 116
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II				Questionnaires: 44
Instructor:	Glezen,John				

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	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 152 11		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 135			
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II											Questionnaires: 108			
Instructor:	Trott,David W.														

				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	4	11	30	32	31	3.69	1375/1542	4.25	4.25	4.33	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	13	35	32	23	3.51	1406/1542	4.21	4.21	4.29	4.23	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	11	30	25	35	3.70	1148/1339	4.21	4.25	4.32	4.14	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	5	9	24	24	19	3.53	1334/1498	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.08	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	26	4	12	21	14	28	3.63	1173/1428	3.73	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	44	6	6	15	14	19	3.57	1175/1407	4.08	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	6	25	24	47	4.01	1046/1521	4.38	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.01
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	1	1	4	96	4.91	620/1541	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	10	13	30	28	5	3.06	1418/1518	3.89	3.93	4.11	4.00	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	12	26	27	39	3.84	1317/1472	4.34	4.41	4.46	4.38	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	5	4	24	27	46	3.99	1398/1475	4.64	4.67	4.72	4.63	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	7	19	31	23	26	3.40	1361/1471	4.05	4.12	4.32	4.23	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	5	14	18	14	27	27	3.35	1356/1470	4.19	4.22	4.33	4.21	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	12	21	18	20	24	3.24	1171/1310	3.63	3.72	4.06	3.93	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	3	15	21	40	4.16	696/1210	3.59	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	5	10	18	20	27	3.68	1064/1211	3.55	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	3	6	14	25	33	3.98	938/1207	3.79	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.98
4. Were special techniques successful	28	41	6	8	10	5	10	3.13	809/859	3.18	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:		135
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II										Questionnaires:		108
Instructor:	Trott,David W.												

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	101	1	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	101	0	2	3	0	0	2	2.57	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	101	1	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	102	1	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	101	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	104	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	103	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	103	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	104	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	103	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	104	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	104	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	103	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	104	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	103	1	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	104	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	104	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	104	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	135
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II				Questionnaires:	108
Instructor:	Trott,David W.					

			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	104	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	103	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	22	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	79	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	1	B	46						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	25	General	1	Under-grad	108	Non-major	106
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	21	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	18						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152H 01	**Term - Spring 2012**	**Enrollment: 9**	
Title: Calc/Analy Geom II-Honrs		**Questionnaires: 6**	
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	0	6	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.25	4.33	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	615/1542	4.50	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	757/1339	4.33	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1376/1498	3.40	4.09	4.26	4.08	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1360/1428	3.00	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1309/1407	3.20	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	934/1521	4.17	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	783/1518	4.17	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1022/1472	4.33	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.67	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1015/1471	4.17	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	692/1470	4.50	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	324/1310	4.50	3.72	4.06	3.93	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	634/1210	4.25	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	580/1211	4.50	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	402/1207	4.75	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 152H 01	**Term - Spring 2012**	**Enrollment: 9**
Title: Calc/Analy Geom II-Honrs		**Questionnaires: 6**
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 97				
Title:	**Applied Calculus**									**Questionnaires: 69**				
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	14	20	32	4.21	1017/1542	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	10	16	37	4.25	929/1542	4.33	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	6	10	18	30	4.03	970/1339	4.14	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	3	4	9	23	21	3.92	1149/1498	3.94	4.09	4.26	4.08	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	17	5	3	14	14	11	3.49	1237/1428	3.48	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	10	4	6	13	18	14	3.58	1164/1407	3.64	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	10	15	38	4.32	772/1521	4.19	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	41	23	4.36	1251/1541	4.68	4.81	4.70	4.66	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	0	0	11	24	15	4.08	857/1518	4.04	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	9	51	4.75	469/1472	4.69	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	7	54	4.85	673/1475	4.85	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	3	8	14	37	4.37	821/1471	4.39	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	6	14	40	4.47	740/1470	4.53	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	11	3	2	5	14	25	4.14	674/1310	4.13	3.72	4.06	3.93	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	5	21	12	14	3.32	1081/1210	3.86	3.58	4.18	3.91	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	10	10	11	15	14	3.22	1149/1211	3.62	3.67	4.37	4.15	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	9	11	15	19	3.62	1071/1207	3.91	3.77	4.41	4.12	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	11	21	4	8	6	9	10	3.35	763/859	3.44	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 155 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 97
Title: Applied Calculus				Questionnaires: 69
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	42	1	5	2	6	5	8	3.35	185/207	3.67	4.34	4.12	3.92	3.35
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	1	8	8	8	3.92	150/210	4.26	4.58	4.17	4.14	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	1	4	3	5	7	3.65	197/202	3.65	3.65	4.50	4.49	3.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	4	2	3	1	7	9	3.82	176/202	3.91	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	1	2	4	3	8	8	3.64	161/199	4.10	4.40	4.15	4.14	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	1	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	2	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	1	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	1	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	1	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 97
Title:	Applied Calculus		Questionnaires: 69
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	10	C	16	General	2	Under-grad	69	Non-major	69
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 04			Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 74			
Title:	Applied Calculus											Questionnaires: 35			
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	10	18	4.31	895/1542	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	10	21	4.40	754/1542	4.33	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	7	21	4.26	825/1339	4.14	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	5	7	16	3.97	1098/1498	3.94	4.09	4.26	4.08	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	4	1	4	11	5	3.48	1237/1428	3.48	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	8	9	7	3.70	1108/1407	3.64	4.12	4.15	3.92	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	3	11	16	4.06	1021/1521	4.19	4.28	4.20	4.09	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1541	4.68	4.81	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	7	10	7	4.00	920/1518	4.04	3.93	4.11	4.00	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	7	23	4.63	659/1472	4.69	4.41	4.46	4.38	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	700/1475	4.85	4.67	4.72	4.63	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	12	17	4.41	785/1471	4.39	4.12	4.32	4.23	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	4	24	4.59	598/1470	4.53	4.22	4.33	4.21	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	698/1310	4.13	3.72	4.06	3.93	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	8	22	4.41	513/1210	3.86	3.58	4.18	3.91	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	3	6	8	16	4.03	911/1211	3.62	3.67	4.37	4.15	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	4	11	17	4.21	840/1207	3.91	3.77	4.41	4.12	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	1	21	1	1	5	2	4	3.54	702/859	3.44	3.43	4.08	3.95	3.54

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 155 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 74
Title: Applied Calculus		Questionnaires: 35
Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	25	1	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	121/207	3.67	4.34	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	38/210	4.26	4.58	4.17	4.14	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	****/202	3.65	3.65	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	148/202	3.91	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	56/199	4.10	4.40	4.15	4.14	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 155 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	74
Title:	Applied Calculus			Questionnaires:	35
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala				

Questions	NR	NA	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	32	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 1		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 42			
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci									Questionnaires: 22			
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan												

			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	3	0	3	9	7	3.77	1331/1542	3.75	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	4	9	3.64	1359/1542	3.71	4.21	4.29	4.29	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	5	11	3.95	1018/1339	4.03	4.25	4.32	4.40	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	1	2	1	6	3.67	1281/1498	3.75	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	3	0	3	1	6	3.54	1219/1428	3.59	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1164/1407	3.79	4.12	4.15	4.14	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	2	13	4.25	838/1521	4.01	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	771/1541	4.90	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	2	4	6	3	3.11	1411/1518	3.34	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	2	4	12	4.20	1120/1472	4.41	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	3	4	10	3.86	1421/1475	3.98	4.67	4.72	4.79	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	1	6	10	4.00	1104/1471	4.00	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	1009/1470	4.18	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1310	4.00	3.72	4.06	4.19	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	2	1	4	3.18	1107/1210	3.48	3.58	4.18	4.18	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	6	2	0	1	3	2.42	1206/1211	2.71	3.67	4.37	4.34	2.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	6	2	0	1	3	2.42	1204/1207	2.79	3.77	4.41	4.40	2.42
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 1		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 42
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci							Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan							

				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	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	3.00	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	3.40	3.40	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

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	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 215 2	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 61
Title: Finite Math For Info Sci		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Kapoor,Jagmohan		

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	2	2	2	5	7	3.72	1359/1542	3.75	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	8	3.78	1291/1542	3.71	4.21	4.29	4.29	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	935/1339	4.03	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1199/1498	3.75	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1173/1428	3.59	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	874/1407	3.79	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	3	7	3.78	1212/1521	4.01	4.28	4.20	4.22	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	413/1541	4.90	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	1	5	3	3.58	1255/1518	3.34	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	674/1472	4.41	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	1382/1475	3.98	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	1104/1471	4.00	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	4	10	4.17	1030/1470	4.18	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	761/1310	4.00	3.72	4.06	4.19	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	0	1	8	3.77	918/1210	3.48	3.58	4.18	4.18	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	0	4	2	3	3.00	1178/1211	2.71	3.67	4.37	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	1	1	3	4	3.15	1167/1207	2.79	3.77	4.41	4.40	3.15
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 215 2		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 61
Title: Finite Math For Info Sci				Questionnaires: 18
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
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.62	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	33/35	3.00	3.00	4.36	4.10	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	27/30	3.40	3.40	4.27	3.95	3.40
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 215 2	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 61
Title:	Finite Math For Info Sci			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 56	
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra					Questionnaires: 28	
Instructor: Nanes,Kalman M						

| | | | 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	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	423/1542	4.19	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	670/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	671/1339	4.23	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	646/1498	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	569/1428	4.12	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	530/1407	4.22	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	13	11	4.30	795/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	276/1541	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	698/1518	3.81	3.93	4.11	4.12	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	452/1472	4.44	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	592/1475	4.60	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	587/1471	4.04	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	20	4.57	619/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	546/1310	3.72	3.72	4.06	4.19	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1210	3.17	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1003/1207	3.42	3.77	4.41	4.40	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 56			
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra										Questionnaires: 28			
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M													

			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	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 01			Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 56		
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra											Questionnaires: 28		
Instructor: Nanes,Kalman M													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 51
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 34
Instructor: Park,DoHwan		

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	2	2	4	14	12	3.94	1228/1542	4.19	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	10	10	12	3.91	1199/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	10	12	3.85	1082/1339	4.23	4.25	4.32	4.40	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	2	7	6	4	3.63	1294/1498	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	2	4	7	7	3.57	1207/1428	4.12	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	874/1407	4.22	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	14	15	4.28	806/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	276/1541	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	3	13	8	3	3.32	1357/1518	3.81	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	18	10	4.12	1183/1472	4.44	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	8	14	11	4.03	1394/1475	4.60	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	11	14	3	3.38	1363/1471	4.04	4.12	4.32	4.37	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	9	11	7	3.38	1348/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	1	5	4	1	3.08	1213/1310	3.72	3.72	4.06	4.19	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1186/1210	3.17	3.58	4.18	4.18	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	3	1	3	0	2	2.67	1198/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	2	1	4	0	2	2.89	1187/1207	3.42	3.77	4.41	4.40	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	25	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 02		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	51
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra				Questionnaires:	34
Instructor:	Park,DoHwan					

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	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 03	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 56
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 32
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	0	0	13	9	10	3.91	1265/1542	4.19	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	12	10	3.88	1229/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	10	14	4.19	880/1339	4.23	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	2	5	6	4	3.71	1263/1498	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	3	11	11	4.04	833/1428	4.12	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	1053/1407	4.22	4.12	4.15	4.14	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	12	14	4.19	913/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	276/1541	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	2	0	9	10	2	3.43	1320/1518	3.81	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	8	10	12	4.06	1202/1472	4.44	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	727/1475	4.60	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	8	10	7	3.60	1308/1471	4.04	4.12	4.32	4.37	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	11	5	11	3.73	1243/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	1064/1310	3.72	3.72	4.06	4.19	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	966/1210	3.17	3.58	4.18	4.18	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1134/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1097/1207	3.42	3.77	4.41	4.40	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 03	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 56
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 32
Instructor: Lo,James T		

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	30	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 57
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 25
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	13	4.24	973/1542	4.19	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	799/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	17	4.52	560/1339	4.23	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	7	11	4.24	874/1498	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	421/1428	4.12	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	345/1407	4.22	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	185/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	620/1541	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	881/1518	3.81	3.93	4.11	4.12	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	715/1472	4.44	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	1197/1475	4.60	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	2	16	4.35	858/1471	4.04	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	2	3	14	4.23	985/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	606/1310	3.72	3.72	4.06	4.19	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1210	3.17	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1207	3.42	3.77	4.41	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment:	57
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra											Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	57
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra			Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai				

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 05			Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 45				
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra									Questionnaires: 24				
Instructor:	Liu,Xing													

			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	0	1	4	8	11	4.21	1017/1542	4.19	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	787/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	9	4.17	896/1339	4.23	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	488/1498	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	681/1428	4.12	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	599/1407	4.22	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	474/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	13	9	4.30	1295/1541	4.82	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	10	5	4.00	920/1518	3.81	3.93	4.11	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	538/1472	4.44	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	897/1475	4.60	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	870/1471	4.04	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	16	4.33	886/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1064/1310	3.72	3.72	4.06	4.19	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/1210	3.17	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/1207	3.42	3.77	4.41	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 221 05	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 45
Title: Intro To Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Liu,Xing		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 221 05			Term - Spring 2012										Enrollment: 45	
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra													Questionnaires: 24	
Instructor:	Liu,Xing														

				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	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 46				
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns									Questionnaires: 32				
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube													

				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	1	0	2	9	20	4.47	691/1542	4.27	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	20	4.47	670/1542	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	18	4.47	626/1339	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	298/1498	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	714/1428	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	997/1407	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.14	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	27	4.72	268/1521	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1541	4.79	4.81	4.70	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	14	12	4.13	822/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	24	4.63	659/1472	4.19	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	215/1475	4.56	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	10	18	4.42	770/1471	4.02	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	24	4.56	629/1470	4.03	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	4	4	4	6	5	3.17	1192/1310	3.47	3.72	4.06	4.19	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1210	2.80	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment:	46
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns											Questionnaires:	32
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1207	3.60	3.77	4.41	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	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 225 02		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 39				
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns									Questionnaires: 23				
Instructor:	Soane,Ana Maria													

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	8	15	4.65	448/1542	4.27	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	378/1542	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	234/1339	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	767/1498	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	821/1428	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	252/1407	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	452/1521	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	345/1541	4.79	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	588/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	702/1472	4.19	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	1000/1475	4.56	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	681/1471	4.02	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	336/1470	4.03	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	761/1310	3.47	3.72	4.06	4.19	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1210	2.80	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1207	3.60	3.77	4.41	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 39			
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns										Questionnaires: 23			
Instructor:	Soane,Ana Maria													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	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	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 225 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 39
Title: Intro Differentl Equatns		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Soane,Ana Maria		

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	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	5				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 56
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns				Questionnaires: 11
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1110/1542	4.27	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	799/1542	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	880/1339	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	357/1498	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1007/1428	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	505/1407	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	588/1521	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1360/1541	4.79	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1178/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	0	2	5	3.90	1296/1472	4.19	4.41	4.46	4.53	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	1271/1475	4.56	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	2	4	3.70	1267/1471	4.02	4.12	4.32	4.37	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1289/1470	4.03	4.22	4.33	4.40	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1168/1310	3.47	3.72	4.06	4.19	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	2.80	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	3.60	3.77	4.41	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 225 03		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 56
Title: Intro Differentl Equatns				Questionnaires: 11
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.62	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 56
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns			Questionnaires: 11
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
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 225 04		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 26		
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns										Questionnaires: 17		
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**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	1275/1542	4.27	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	7	3	3.59	1382/1542	4.28	4.21	4.29	4.29	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	8	3	3	2	2.82	1314/1339	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.40	2.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1299/1498	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	681/1428	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	684/1407	4.31	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	913/1521	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1541	4.79	4.81	4.70	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	5	5	0	3.15	1400/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	3	8	3	3.65	1375/1472	4.19	4.41	4.46	4.53	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	0	3	11	4.18	1361/1475	4.56	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	6	3	3.47	1340/1471	4.02	4.12	4.32	4.37	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	4	4	3	3.19	1388/1470	4.03	4.22	4.33	4.40	3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1310	3.47	3.72	4.06	4.19	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1175/1210	2.80	3.58	4.18	4.18	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1178/1211	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1075/1207	3.60	3.77	4.41	4.40	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 225 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title: Intro Differentl Equatns		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Lo,James T		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	4	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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 48				
Title:	Multivariable Calculus										Questionnaires: 35				
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.														

				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	3	2	8	14	8	3.63	1403/1542	4.31	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	5	15	6	3.40	1430/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	6	12	6	3.92	1039/1339	4.40	4.25	4.32	4.40	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	1	6	7	3	3.56	1327/1498	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	4	1	3	7	3	3.22	1321/1428	3.99	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	3	5	8	5	3.59	1158/1407	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.14	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	7	10	12	3.77	1212/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	6	28	0	3.77	1515/1541	4.66	4.81	4.70	4.68	3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	10	12	5	3.47	1304/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	3	16	12	4.00	1222/1472	4.50	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	27	4.69	1013/1475	4.69	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	8	15	8	3.74	1249/1471	4.19	4.12	4.32	4.37	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	3	13	10	3.57	1297/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	2	0	5	3	2	3.25	1168/1310	3.27	3.72	4.06	4.19	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	3	2	1	0	2.11	1205/1210	2.44	3.58	4.18	4.18	2.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	1	3	4	0	3.11	1169/1211	2.78	3.67	4.37	4.34	3.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1063/1207	3.11	3.77	4.41	4.40	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	26	5	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 48			
Title:	Multivariable Calculus									Questionnaires: 35			
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 48
Title:	Multivariable Calculus			Questionnaires: 35
Instructor:	Chin,Sang H.			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02			Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 51			
Title:	Multivariable Calculus									Questionnaires: 27			
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube												

				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	0	0	6	3	18	4.44	720/1542	4.31	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	14	4.30	879/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	14	4.30	793/1339	4.40	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	6	4	5	3.93	1129/1498	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	931/1428	3.99	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	828/1407	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	20	4.59	419/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	0	25	4.88	721/1541	4.66	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	988/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	7	18	4.56	753/1472	4.50	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	430/1475	4.69	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	858/1471	4.19	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	3	17	4.26	960/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	3	8	3	11	3.88	875/1310	3.27	3.72	4.06	4.19	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	1	2	1	2	2.78	1178/1210	2.44	3.58	4.18	4.18	2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	4	1	2	0	2	2.44	1205/1211	2.78	3.67	4.37	4.34	2.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	2	4	0	1	2.56	1203/1207	3.11	3.77	4.41	4.40	2.56
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 51
Title:	Multivariable Calculus			Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube			

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	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 38				
Title:	Multivariable Calculus									Questionnaires: 15				
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai													

				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	1	1	0	1	12	4.47	691/1542	4.31	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	754/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	277/1339	4.40	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	1012/1498	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	681/1428	3.99	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	819/1407	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.14	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	408/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1541	4.66	4.81	4.70	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1029/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	288/1472	4.50	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1372/1475	4.69	4.67	4.72	4.79	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	846/1471	4.19	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	1044/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1271/1310	3.27	3.72	4.06	4.19	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1210	2.44	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1211	2.78	3.67	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1207	3.11	3.77	4.41	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 38
Title:	Multivariable Calculus			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Shen,Jinglai			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	1	to be significant			
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04			Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 23			
Title:	Multivariable Calculus									Questionnaires: 10			
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee												

			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	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	385/1542	4.31	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	366/1542	4.20	4.21	4.29	4.29	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	476/1339	4.40	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1188/1498	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	301/1428	3.99	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1053/1407	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.14	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	278/1521	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.66	4.81	4.70	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	920/1518	3.84	3.93	4.11	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	690/1472	4.50	4.41	4.46	4.53	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1475	4.69	4.67	4.72	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	907/1471	4.19	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	985/1470	4.05	4.22	4.33	4.40	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1310	3.27	3.72	4.06	4.19	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1210	2.44	3.58	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1211	2.78	3.67	4.37	4.34	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 23
Title:	Multivariable Calculus		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1207	3.11	3.77	4.41	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 41
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I					Questionnaires: 34
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa					

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	3	28	4.74	347/1542	4.66	4.25	4.33	4.37	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	28	4.76	283/1542	4.72	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	29	4.79	265/1339	4.81	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	646/1498	4.58	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	2	4	4	9	3.76	1090/1428	3.91	3.90	4.12	4.15	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	619/1407	4.43	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	25	4.59	430/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	142/1518	4.61	3.93	4.11	4.13	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	209/1472	4.84	4.41	4.46	4.46	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	32	4.94	376/1475	4.95	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	268/1471	4.69	4.12	4.32	4.33	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	177/1470	4.74	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	24	2	0	1	0	6	3.89	875/1310	3.79	3.72	4.06	4.11	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 301 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 41
Title: Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires: 34
Instructor: Gowda,Muddappa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	2.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	15
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 301 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 38
Title: Intro Math Analysis I		Questionnaires: 22
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	1	1	4	16	4.59	524/1542	4.66	4.25	4.33	4.37	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	391/1542	4.72	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	244/1339	4.81	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	275/1498	4.58	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	3	2	10	4.06	821/1428	3.91	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	365/1407	4.43	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	588/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	8	11	4.40	494/1518	4.61	3.93	4.11	4.13	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	435/1472	4.84	4.41	4.46	4.46	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	269/1475	4.95	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	567/1471	4.69	4.12	4.32	4.33	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	619/1470	4.74	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	973/1310	3.79	3.72	4.06	4.11	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	38
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I			Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Suri,Manil				

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.13	****

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	2	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	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 302 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment:	22			
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II									Questionnaires:	12			
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas													

			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	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1343/1542	3.75	4.25	4.33	4.37	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	3	3.50	1406/1542	3.50	4.21	4.29	4.31	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	982/1339	4.00	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1346/1498	3.50	4.09	4.26	4.32	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1061/1428	3.80	3.90	4.12	4.15	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1013/1407	3.86	4.12	4.15	4.20	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	4	3	2	1	2.82	1468/1521	2.82	4.28	4.20	4.23	2.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1425/1518	3.00	3.93	4.11	4.13	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1433/1472	3.08	4.41	4.46	4.46	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1197/1475	4.50	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1429/1471	2.92	4.12	4.32	4.33	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	0	5	3.42	1340/1470	3.42	4.22	4.33	4.35	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1218/1310	3.00	3.72	4.06	4.11	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1095/1210	3.25	3.58	4.18	4.27	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	796/1211	4.25	3.67	4.37	4.45	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1038/1207	3.75	3.77	4.41	4.51	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 302 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 22			
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II									Questionnaires: 12			
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas												

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	2.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 302 01		Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment:	22
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II						Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas							

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	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	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 306 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 26
Title:	Geometry					Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma					

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	2	8	1	6	3.50	1432/1542	3.50	4.25	4.33	4.37	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	6	3	3.39	1436/1542	3.39	4.21	4.29	4.31	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	5	4	3.33	1256/1339	3.33	4.25	4.32	4.36	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1176/1498	3.88	4.09	4.26	4.32	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	797/1428	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	810/1407	4.13	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	4	5	3	3.24	1395/1521	3.24	4.28	4.20	4.23	3.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	803/1541	4.83	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	3	5	2	3.31	1362/1518	3.31	3.93	4.11	4.13	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1340/1472	3.76	4.41	4.46	4.46	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	7	3	7	3.83	1424/1475	3.83	4.67	4.72	4.74	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	4	8	2	3.35	1369/1471	3.35	4.12	4.32	4.33	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	4	5	3.44	1333/1470	3.44	4.22	4.33	4.35	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1113/1310	3.40	3.72	4.06	4.11	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 306 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	26
Title:	Geometry			Questionnaires:	18
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 341 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 31
Title: Computational Methods				Questionnaires: 24
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	0	2	5	17	4.63	486/1542	4.63	4.25	4.33	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	516/1542	4.58	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	497/1339	4.58	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	966/1498	4.14	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	7	4	6	3.94	931/1428	3.94	3.90	4.12	4.15	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	455/1407	4.47	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	696/1521	4.38	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	345/1541	4.96	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	793/1518	4.16	3.93	4.11	4.13	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	105/1472	4.96	4.41	4.46	4.46	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	484/1475	4.92	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	463/1471	4.67	4.12	4.32	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	19	4.71	438/1470	4.71	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	968/1310	3.71	3.72	4.06	4.11	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	774/1210	4.00	3.58	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 341 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 31
Title:	Computational Methods			Questionnaires: 24
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	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 385 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 47
Title:	Intro To Math Modeling				Questionnaires: 33
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	0	0	0	1	7	14	11	4.06	1131/1542	4.06	4.25	4.33	4.37	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	15	4.24	942/1542	4.24	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	11	17	4.36	730/1339	4.36	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	966/1498	4.14	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	2	0	7	4	7	3.70	1134/1428	3.70	3.90	4.12	4.15	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	7	8	7	3.87	1005/1407	3.87	4.12	4.15	4.20	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	485/1521	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.23	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	8	15	4	3.85	1093/1518	3.85	3.93	4.11	4.13	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	23	4.65	629/1472	4.65	4.41	4.46	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	987/1475	4.71	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	13	15	4.35	846/1471	4.35	4.12	4.32	4.33	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	8	17	4.23	985/1470	4.23	4.22	4.33	4.35	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	6	3	5	3	1	2.44	1288/1310	2.44	3.72	4.06	4.11	2.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 385 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 47
Title:	Intro To Math Modeling			Questionnaires: 33
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
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01				Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I										Questionnaires:	18
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	1095/1542	3.59	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	615/1542	3.57	4.21	4.29	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	529/1339	3.74	4.25	4.32	4.44	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	252/1498	3.78	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	703/1428	3.13	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	455/1407	3.64	4.12	4.15	4.30	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	395/1521	3.44	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	4.90	4.81	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	744/1518	3.18	3.93	4.11	4.18	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	629/1472	3.46	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	754/1475	4.58	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	770/1471	3.14	4.12	4.32	4.36	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	976/1470	3.26	4.22	4.33	4.38	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	3	3	4	1	3.27	1162/1310	3.27	3.72	4.06	4.09	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1210	3.00	3.58	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/1211	3.67	3.67	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1207	3.50	3.77	4.41	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/859	2.50	3.43	4.08	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I			Questionnaires:	18
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.02	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 29		
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I									Questionnaires: 18		
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**
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	4	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MATH 404 02		Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 20
Title: Intro Part Diff Eq I			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Seidman,Thomas			

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	3	2	4	3	3	3.07	1497/1542	3.59	4.25	4.33	4.42	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	3	1	2	2.64	1524/1542	3.57	4.21	4.29	4.33	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	4	1	2.93	1303/1339	3.74	4.25	4.32	4.44	2.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1477/1498	3.78	4.09	4.26	4.35	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	7	1	3	1	1	2.08	1421/1428	3.13	3.90	4.12	4.22	2.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1378/1407	3.64	4.12	4.15	4.30	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	1	3	1	2.27	1506/1521	3.44	4.28	4.20	4.24	2.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	853/1541	4.90	4.81	4.70	4.72	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	5	2	5	1	0	2.15	1509/1518	3.18	3.93	4.11	4.18	2.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	5	2	2	1	2.27	1469/1472	3.46	4.41	4.46	4.50	2.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	1305/1475	4.58	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	8	4	1	1	1	1.87	1469/1471	3.14	4.12	4.32	4.36	1.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	3	4	1	1	2.29	1451/1470	3.26	4.22	4.33	4.38	2.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1310	3.27	3.72	4.06	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1123/1210	3.00	3.58	4.18	4.34	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1066/1211	3.67	3.67	4.37	4.47	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1097/1207	3.50	3.77	4.41	4.53	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 404 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	843/859	2.50	3.43	4.08	4.19	2.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	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 407 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 21
Title: Modern Algebra & No.Theo		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma		

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	0	0	3	2	3.83	1300/1542	3.83	4.25	4.33	4.42	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1257/1542	3.83	4.21	4.29	4.33	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	982/1339	4.00	4.25	4.32	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	357/1498	4.67	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.12	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	518/1521	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1107/1518	3.83	3.93	4.11	4.18	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1222/1472	4.00	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	3.50	1332/1471	3.50	4.12	4.32	4.36	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1208/1470	3.83	4.22	4.33	4.38	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 407 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	21
Title:	Modern Algebra & No.Theo			Questionnaires:	6
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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 408 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 9
Title:	Intro Abstract Algebra		Questionnaires: 3
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	869/1542	4.33	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	833/1542	4.33	4.21	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	414/1339	4.67	4.25	4.32	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1498	4.50	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1428	5.00	3.90	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.12	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	330/1521	4.67	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1213/1518	3.67	3.93	4.11	4.18	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1222/1472	4.00	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1305/1475	4.33	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1283/1471	3.67	4.12	4.32	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1108/1470	4.00	4.22	4.33	4.38	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 408 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	9
Title:	Intro Abstract Algebra				Questionnaires:	3
Instructor:	Guler,Osman					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1310	5.00	3.72	4.06	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 409 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title:	Intro To Math Logic		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma		

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	4	2	2	3.75	1343/1542	3.75	4.25	4.33	4.42	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1365/1542	3.63	4.21	4.29	4.33	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	982/1339	4.00	4.25	4.32	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1216/1498	3.80	4.09	4.26	4.35	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1156/1428	3.67	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1013/1407	3.86	4.12	4.15	4.30	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	0	1	3.00	1434/1521	3.00	4.28	4.20	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1367/1518	3.29	3.93	4.11	4.18	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1222/1472	4.00	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1256/1475	4.43	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1381/1471	3.29	4.12	4.32	4.36	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1201/1470	3.86	4.22	4.33	4.38	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	761/1310	4.00	3.72	4.06	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 409 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	15
Title:	Intro To Math Logic										Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 411 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 30			
Title:	Linear Algebra										Questionnaires: 24			
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa													

			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	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	632/1542	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	169/1542	4.88	4.21	4.29	4.33	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	265/1339	4.79	4.25	4.32	4.44	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	512/1498	4.53	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	118/1407	4.86	4.12	4.15	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	89/1521	4.92	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	175/1518	4.76	3.93	4.11	4.18	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	105/1472	4.96	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.67	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	146/1471	4.92	4.12	4.32	4.36	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	284/1470	4.83	4.22	4.33	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1310	****	3.72	4.06	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 411 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 30
Title:	Linear Algebra		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 423 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	**Differential Geometry**			**Questionnaires: 16**
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	4	12	4.75	322/1542	4.75	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	541/1542	4.56	4.21	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	393/1339	4.69	4.25	4.32	4.44	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1199/1498	3.83	4.09	4.26	4.35	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	736/1428	4.15	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	480/1407	4.44	4.12	4.15	4.30	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	913/1521	4.19	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1029/1541	4.63	4.81	4.70	4.72	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	286/1518	4.62	3.93	4.11	4.18	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	401/1472	4.79	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	430/1475	4.93	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	488/1471	4.64	4.12	4.32	4.36	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	336/1470	4.79	4.22	4.33	4.38	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	425/1310	4.40	3.72	4.06	4.09	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 423 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 20
Title:	Differential Geometry		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Zweck,John W		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.02	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.23	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	3.77	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 423 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Differential Geometry			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Zweck,John W			

			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	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	2.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 37				
Title:	Matrix Analysis							Questionnaires: 21				
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	0	0	0	2	4	7	8	4.00	1173/1542	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	2	7	3.57	1385/1542	3.57	4.21	4.29	4.33	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	4	3	7	3.33	1256/1339	3.33	4.25	4.32	4.44	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1160/1498	3.91	4.09	4.26	4.35	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1097/1428	3.75	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	480/1407	4.44	4.12	4.15	4.30	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	944/1521	4.15	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	771/1541	4.86	4.81	4.70	4.72	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1283/1518	3.50	3.93	4.11	4.18	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	1022/1472	4.33	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	1158/1475	4.55	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	1083/1471	4.05	4.12	4.32	4.36	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	3	4	8	3.55	1303/1470	3.55	4.22	4.33	4.38	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1310	****	3.72	4.06	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1073/1210	3.33	3.58	4.18	4.34	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	3	0	0	3	3.50	1100/1211	3.50	3.67	4.37	4.47	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	769/1207	4.33	3.77	4.41	4.53	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 37			
Title:	Matrix Analysis										Questionnaires: 21			
Instructor:	Kang,Weining													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.34	4.12	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.58	4.17	4.02	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	3.65	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.27	4.32	4.23	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	3.77	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	3.40	4.27	3.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	37
Title:	Matrix Analysis				Questionnaires:	21
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	2.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	6	**** - 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 2012								Enrollment: 30			
Title:	History Of Mathematics										Questionnaires: 21			
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha													

			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	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	499/1542	4.62	4.25	4.33	4.42	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	776/1542	4.38	4.21	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	712/1339	4.38	4.25	4.32	4.44	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	660/1498	4.43	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1097/1428	3.75	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	505/1407	4.43	4.12	4.15	4.30	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	496/1521	4.52	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	689/1541	4.90	4.81	4.70	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	9	6	4.00	920/1518	4.00	3.93	4.11	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	598/1472	4.67	4.41	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	987/1475	4.70	4.67	4.72	4.74	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	846/1471	4.35	4.12	4.32	4.36	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	573/1470	4.61	4.22	4.33	4.38	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	968/1310	3.71	3.72	4.06	4.09	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 432 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 30
Title:	History Of Mathematics			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 612 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 16
Title:	Ordinary Differential Eq			Questionnaires: 15
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	2	13	4.87	205/1542	4.87	4.25	4.33	4.39	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	324/1542	4.73	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	337/1339	4.73	4.25	4.32	4.31	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	452/1498	4.58	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	578/1428	4.30	3.90	4.12	4.13	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	375/1407	4.54	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	330/1521	4.67	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	349/1518	4.53	3.93	4.11	4.15	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	486/1472	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	646/1475	4.87	4.67	4.72	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	463/1471	4.67	4.12	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	399/1470	4.73	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1310	4.80	3.72	4.06	3.99	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1210	****	3.58	4.18	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	****	3.67	4.37	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 612 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	16
Title:	Ordinary Differential Eq										Questionnaires:	15
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
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1207	****	3.77	4.41	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 630 01			Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 11		
Title:	Numerical Linear Algebra										Questionnaires: 10		
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	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1542	4.90	4.25	4.33	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	754/1542	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	157/1339	4.90	4.25	4.32	4.31	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	632/1498	4.44	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	452/1428	4.44	3.90	4.12	4.13	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	559/1407	4.38	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	408/1521	4.60	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	445/1518	4.44	3.93	4.11	4.15	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	690/1472	4.60	4.41	4.46	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	538/1475	4.90	4.67	4.72	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	907/1471	4.30	4.12	4.32	4.36	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	588/1470	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1159/1310	3.29	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1073/1210	3.33	3.58	4.18	4.28	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	5.00	3.67	4.37	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	499/1207	4.67	3.77	4.41	4.53	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 630 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	11
Title:	Numerical Linear Algebra			Questionnaires:	10
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/859	****	3.43	4.08	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 651 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 13			
Title:	Optimization Algorithms									Questionnaires: 10			
Instructor:	Guler,Osman												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	1104/1542	4.10	4.25	4.33	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1322/1542	3.70	4.21	4.29	4.31	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1185/1339	3.60	4.25	4.32	4.31	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1216/1498	3.80	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	989/1407	3.89	4.12	4.15	4.20	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	997/1521	4.10	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1367/1518	3.29	3.93	4.11	4.15	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1022/1472	4.33	4.41	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	861/1475	4.78	4.67	4.72	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1187/1471	3.89	4.12	4.32	4.36	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1268/1470	3.67	4.22	4.33	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	948/1310	3.75	3.72	4.06	3.99	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1123/1210	3.00	3.58	4.18	4.28	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1125/1211	3.40	3.67	4.37	4.51	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1194/1207	2.75	3.77	4.41	4.53	2.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 651 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	13
Title:	Optimization Algorithms				Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Guler,Osman					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	855/859	2.00	3.43	4.08	4.08	2.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	3	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	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 710 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 3	
Title:	Spec Topics In Appl Math					Questionnaires: 2	
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.25	4.33	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1542	4.50	4.21	4.29	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1058/1498	4.00	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.12	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1455/1541	4.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1518	4.50	3.93	4.11	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.41	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.67	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1471	5.00	4.12	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.22	4.33	4.34	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MATH 710 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Spec Topics In Appl Math			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1310	5.00	3.72	4.06	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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