Course-Section: PHYS 100 0101 University of Maryland IDEAS IN PHYSICS

Title Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL

Enrollment: 129 Questionnaires: 65 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1298 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencie						Inst	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne		ls from this course	2	0	0	0	1	20	42	4.65	446/1649	4.65	4.19	4.28	4.11	4.65
_	-		the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	14	47	4.71	300/1648	3 4.71	4.07	4.23	4.16	4.71
			the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	10	51	4.81	233/1375	4.81	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.81
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the expected goals	3	31	0	1	1	8	21	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.58
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contribut	te to what you learned	2	10	2	1	11	9	30	4.21	673/1533	4.21	3.88	4.04	3.87	4.21
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contril	bute to what you learned	4	40	1	1	2	1	16	4.43	493/1512	4.43	3.91	4.10	3.86	4.43
7. Was th	ne gradino	system clearly	explained	2	0	0	0	5	6	52	4.75	230/1623	4.75	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.75
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	lled	3	3	0	0	0	8	51	4.86	731/1646	4.86	4.92	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	13	4	0	0	1	20	27	4.54	339/1621	4.54	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.54
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	55	4.92	220/1568	4.92	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.92
			sted in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	60	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.64	5.00
			and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	10	48	4.80	278/1564	4.80	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.80
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	53	4.87	250/1559	4.87	4.21	4.29	4.20	4.87
			ance your understanding	7	2	0	0	3	12	41	4.68	201/1352	4.68	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.68
		Discuss	ion														
1. Did cl	lass discu	ssions contribu	te to what you learned	33	0	0	1	2	8	21	4.53	418/1384	4.53	4.22	4.08	3.86	4.53
		ouraged to participate	34	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	312/1382	4.84	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.84	
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discus				0	0	0	3	4	25	4.69				4.30	4.01	4.69
	Were special techniques successful					1	1	1	1	10		****/ 948			3.95	3.75	****
		Laborato	ory														
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequate	e background information	63	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
		Field Wo	ork														
1. Did fi	leld exper	rience contribute	e to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	understand you	r evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was th	ne instruc	ctor available fo	or consultation	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To wha	at degree	could you discus	ss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
		Self Pa	aced														
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribut	te to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did st	udy quest	cions make clear	the expected goal	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the ins	structor helpful	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was th	ne feedbac	ck/tutoring by p	roctors helpful	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were t	there enou	igh proctors for	all the students	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
			Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			ТΣ	⁄pe			Majors	;
00 07	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 32																
28-55	28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 16						ea I	or M	a jor	`s 3	17	Graduat	Æ	0	Majo	Σ	0
56-83 84-150	56-83 10 2.00-2.99 9 C 1 84-150 9 3.00-3.49 9 D 0						1				4	Under-9	grad	65	Non-	-major	65
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0		Ele	ves				4	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enoug	ŗh	
			Р 0		Electives							respons				_	
			I 0		Other						3						

? 1

Course-Section: PHYS 106 0101

Title INTRO ASTROBIOLOGY

Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1299 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.19	4.28	4.11	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	244/1648	4.78	4.07	4.23	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	480/1375	4.59	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	366/1533	4.50	3.88	4.04	3.87	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1512	****	3.91	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	398/1646	4.94	4.92	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	234/1621	4.67	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	123/1559	4.94	4.21	4.29	4.20	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	501/1352	4.27	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	530/1384	4.42	4.22	4.08	3.86	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	875/1382	4.18	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2		4.64		4.64		4.30	4.01	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 948	****		3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.71	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	***	4.13	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.19	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.47	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.80	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	***	****	4.42	4.24	****

Course-Section: PHYS 106 0101
Title INTRO ASTROBIOLOGY

Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1299 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General		Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0103 University of Maryland Title

BASIC PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: LAI, MEIMEI (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 2.0

Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1300 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 6 2 4.25 965/1649 3.99 4.19 4.28 4.11 4.25 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 3 4.25 897/1648 3.92 4.07 4.23 4.16 4.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 546/1375 4.27 4.15 4.27 4.10 4.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 930/1595 3.91 4.05 4.20 4.03 4.17 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 733/1533 3.71 3.88 4.04 3.87 4.13 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 522/1512 3.93 3.91 4.10 3.86 4.40 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 7 1 4.13 957/1623 4.03 4.32 4.16 4.08 4.13 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.99 4.92 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 0 4 2 4.00 914/1621 3.57 3.86 4.06 3.96 3.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.39 4.52 4.43 4.39 4.63 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1572 4.51 4.65 4.70 4.64 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 651/1564 3.89 4.20 4.28 4.20 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 2 3 4.00 1121/1559 4.09 4.21 4.29 4.20 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 3 3 1 3.71 942/1352 4.09 4.04 3.98 3.86 3.71 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.08 3.86 \*\*\*\* 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.29 4.03 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 4.18 3.95 3.75 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 1 0 1 1 1 3.25 208/221 3.26 3.71 4.16 4.05 3.25 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 1 0 2 1 3.75 188/243 3.85 4.03 4.12 4.08 3.75 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 198/ 212 3.86 4.08 4.40 4.43 3.50 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 139/ 209 3.99 4.13 4.35 4.38 4.25 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 3 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 451/555 3.78 4.19 4.29 4.14 3.75 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 83/288 4.00 4.13 3.68 3.54 4.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons ------0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Graduate 0 Major 0 00-27 0 Required for Majors 0 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 General 0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 8 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0103 University of Maryland Page 1301
Title BASIC PHYSICS I Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Title BASIC PHYSICS I E Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		~																
1 Did voi	ı gəin nev	Genera v insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	965/1649	3.99	4.19	4.28	4.11	4.25
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	897/1648		4.07	4.23	4.16	4.25
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	546/1375		4.15	4.27	4.10	4.50
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1599		4.05	4.20	4.03	4.17
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	733/1533		3.88	4.04	3.87	4.13
				o what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	522/1512		3.91	4.10	3.86	4.40
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	957/1623	3 4.03	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How mar	ny times v	vas class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	4.99	4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you gı	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1504/1623	L 3.57	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.50
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lecture		prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1568	3 4.39	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.63
		or seem inter			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1572		4.65	4.70	4.64	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1		****/1564		4.20	4.28	4.20	4.50
		_		-	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1559		4.21	4.29	4.20	4.00
5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	4.09	4.04	3.98	3.86	3.71
		_	_	_														
		Discus			7	0												
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participations.						0	0	0	1	0		****/1384		4.22	4.08	3.86	****
		_	_	d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		,		4.44	4.29	4.03	****
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succe	sstul		7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	3 ****	4.18	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab incr	rease understa	nding o	f the material	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	208/ 223	3.26	3.71	4.16	4.05	3.25
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	188/ 243	3.85	4.03	4.12	4.08	3.75
				or lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	198/ 212	3.86	4.08	4.40	4.43	3.50
		tructor provid			4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	139/ 209	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.25
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	1	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	451/ 555	3.78	4.19	4.29	4.14	3.75
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	3 4.00	4.13	3.68	3.54	4.00
				<b>T</b>			2 1		_									
				Frequ	епсу	DIS	LIDU	ICIOI	1									
Credits Ea				Rea	asons				Ty	уре			Majors					
00-27	A 3		Rec	nuire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 !	0	Graduat	 :е	0	Majo	r	0			
28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	В 2		110	1422	Ju		,010		•	OZ dada.		Ü	1100 ) 0	_	Ü
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-	grad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						El∈	ectiv	ves				0		Means t			_	h
	P 0		0+1						1	respons	ses to b	oe sıgr	uiican	ıt				
		I 0		Otł	ıer					4								
	? 0																	

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0108 University of Maryland
Title BASIC PHYSICS I Baltimore County

I Baltimore County (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Page 1302

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

LAI, MEIMEI

		MP	NA	Fr	_	ncies	s 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean		
		Questions															
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	2	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	996/1649	3.99	4.19	4.28	4.11	4.22
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear the	expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	1094/1648	3.92	4.07	4.23	4.16	4.06
3. Did th	ie exam q	uestions reflect the	expected goals	3	2	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	665/1375	4.27	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.40
		uations reflect the		2	7	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	903/1595	3.91	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.18
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute t	o what you learned	2	1	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	996/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.82
		signments contribute	-	2	8	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1202/1512	3.93	3.91	4.10	3.86	3.60
	-	g system clearly exp	lained	2	2	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	595/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.44
	-	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.99	4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall te	aching effectiveness	4	0	2	4	3	3	4	3.19	1468/1621	3.57	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.51
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	8	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	852/1568	4.39	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.25
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1165/1572	4.51	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.29
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	8	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1091/1564	3.89	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.04
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to wha	t you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1031/1559	4.09	4.21	4.29	4.20	4.08
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	9	2	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	624/1352	4.09	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.11
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	3.86	****
		nts actively encoura	-	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
		ctor encourage fair		19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368	***	4.41	4.30	4.01	****
		Laboratory															
1 Did th	e lah in	crease understanding	of the material	4	0	2	6	0	5	3	3.06	214/ 221	3.26	3.71	4.16	4.05	3.06
		ded with adequate ba		4	0	1	1	3	1	10	4.13	149/ 243	3.85	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.13
		materials available		4	0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	182/ 212	3.86	4.08	4.40	4.43	3.81
		structor provide ass		4	0	3	3	0	3	7	3.50	186/ 209	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.38	3.50
		nts for lab reports		3	7	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	428/ 555	3.78	4.19	4.29		3.90
F 77		Seminar		1.0	^	^	0	0	4	_	4 00	**** / 200	4 00	4 12	2 60	2 54	
5. were c	riteria :	for grading made cle	ar	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	4.13	3.68	3.54	
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry out	field activities	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.50	3.80	3.68	3.51	****
		Self Paced															
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for all	the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	=			Ty	ne			Majors	3
													- 				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	В 5				_					_					
56-83					Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	10	Non-	-major	20
84-150																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	уh
			P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	uticar	ıt			
			I 0	Other						1	.4						

? 0

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0108 University of Maryland Page 1303
Title BASIC PHYSICS I Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

BASIC PHYSICS I Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Instructor: (Instr

Enrollment: 20 Ouestionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 0 4 6 8 4.22 996/1649 3.99 4.19 4.28 4.11 4.22 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 2 3 5 8 4.06 1094/1648 3.92 4.07 4.23 4.16 4.06 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 2 0 1 1 4 9 4.40 665/1375 4.27 4.15 4.27 4.10 4.40 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 7 0 0 3 3 5 4.18 903/1595 3.91 4.05 4.20 4.03 4.18 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 1 4 5 6 3.82 996/1533 3.71 3.88 4.04 3.87 3.82 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 8 0 2 2 4 2 3.60 1202/1512 3.93 3.91 4.10 3.86 3.60 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 2 0 2 0 3 11 4.44 595/1623 4.03 4.32 4.16 4.08 4.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1646 4.99 4.92 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 0 1 0 4 1 3.83 1123/1621 3.57 3.86 4.06 3.96 3.51 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 15 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 1279/1568 4.39 4.52 4.43 4.39 4.25 15 0 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 1 3 1 4.00 1463/1572 4.51 4.65 4.70 4.64 4.29 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 1127/1564 3.89 4.20 4.28 4.20 4.04 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 1 0 2 2 4.00 1121/1559 4.09 4.21 4.29 4.20 4.08 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 1 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1352 4.09 4.04 3.98 3.86 4.11 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.08 3.86 \*\*\*\* 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.29 4.03 \*\*\*\* 19 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 00 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 4.41 4.30 4.01 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 2 6 0 5 3 3.06 214/ 221 3.26 3.71 4.16 4.05 3.06 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 1 3 1 10 4.13 149/243 3.85 4.03 4.12 4.08 4.13 1 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 3 2 6 5 3.81 182/212 3.86 4.08 4.40 4.43 3.81 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 3 3 0 3 7 3.50 186/209 3.99 4.13 4.35 4.38 3.50 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 7 1 1 0 4 4 3.90 428/555 3.78 4.19 4.29 4.14 3.90 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 0 4 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 4.00 4.13 3.68 3.54 \*\*\*\* Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 3.50 3.80 3.68 3.51 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 110 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.99 3.83 \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors 00 - 271 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 2 General 0 56-83 Under-grad 20 Non-major 20 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. Ω P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0109
Title BASIC PHYSICS I
Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC

23

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1304 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain new	insights,skil		m this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	317/1649	3.99	4.19	4.28	4.11	4.76
_	_	or make clear			1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	599/1648	3.92	4.07	4.23	4.16	4.47
3. Did th	ne exam que	stions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	581/1375	4.27	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.47
4. Did ot	her evalua	tions reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	8	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	996/1595	3.91	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.11
5. Did as	signed rea	dings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	624/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	4.25
				o what you learned	1	5	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	1008/1512	3.93	3.91	4.10	3.86	3.92
		system clearly	_	ined	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	345/1623	4.03	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.65
		as class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	17		1/1646	4.99	4.92	4.69	4.67	
9. How wo	ould you gr	ade the overal	l teacl	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	847/1621	3.57	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.12
		Lecture	:															
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lectures	well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	147/1568	4.39	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.94
2. Did th	ne instruct	or seem intere	sted in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	765/1572	4.51	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.83
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	728/1564	3.89	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.44
		contribute to		-	0	0	2	0	1	3	12	4.28	952/1559	4.09	4.21	4.29	4.20	4.28
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	291/1352	4.09	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.53
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	sions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were a	all student	s actively end	ourage	d to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
		_		d open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368	****	4.41	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were s	special tec	hniques succes	sful		17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	***	4.18	3.95	3.75	****
		Laborat	ory															
1. Did th	ne lab incr	ease understar	ding of	f the material	7	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	119/ 221	3.26	3.71	4.16	4.05	4.18
				ground information	7	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	173/ 243	3.85	4.03	4.12	4.08	3.91
	_			or lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	28/ 212	3.86	4.08	4.40	4.43	4.90
		ructor provide			7	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 209	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.38	
5. Were r	requirement	s for lab repo	rts cle	early specified	6	3	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	338/ 555	3.78	4.19	4.29	4.14	4.33
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	clear		17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	15	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 312	3.50	3.80	3.68	3.51	***
		Self F	aced															
5. Were t	here enoug	h proctors for	all th	ne students	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Crodita =	arnod	Clam CDA		Exposted Codes	-			Por					т	20			Madaza	
Credits E		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				кеа	sons				Туј				Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		<b>~</b> -		1				1	TTm cl		0	37		10
56-83 84-150	2 2	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2 1	C 4 D 0		Ger	nera.	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	9	Б 0 F 0		-וק	ectiv	700				0	#### - I	Meana +	here -	re not	- anour	rh
Grau.	P 0							CS				U	response				_	111
	P 0 I 0										1	3	T Capolla	-6 LU L	c argi	ıııcaı.		
						Oth	.101				_	<i>J</i>						
				. 0	0													

Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0110

19

BASIC PHYSICS I

WATTS, SHELLY C

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Page 1305 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		General				_		_	_	_	_							
_	_	insights, skil			0	0	0	1	3	7	6		1149/1649	3.99	4.19	4.28	4.11	4.06
		or make clear	_	-	0	0	0	2	6	7	2		1474/1648	3.92	4.07	4.23	4.16	3.53
	_	stions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	3	12	2		1000/1375	4.27	4.15	4.27	4.10	3.94
		ions reflect			0	8	0	1	2	5	1		1335/1595	3.91	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.67
		dings contribu			1	0	2	2	2	7	3		1296/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.44
	-	-		at you learned	1	6	1	0	2	7	0		1266/1512	3.93	3.91	4.10	3.86	3.50
		system clearly	_		1	0	0	4	2	7	3		1363/1623	4.03	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.56
	_	as class cance		. 6 6 !	1	0	0	0	0	1 5		4.94		4.99	4.92	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How wou	ıla you gra	ade the overal	I teaching	effectiveness	4	0	U	U	2	5	6	4.31	632/1621	3.57	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.31
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instruct	or's lectures	well prepa	ared	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	1088/1568	4.39	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the	instructo	or seem intere	sted in the	e subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	1313/1572	4.51	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.41
		rial presented		-	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1105/1564	3.89	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.06
4. Did the	lectures	contribute to	what you	learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1121/1559	4.09	4.21	4.29	4.20	4.00
5. Did aud	liovisual t	echniques enh	nance your	understanding	1	2	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	650/1352	4.09	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.07
		-	-	3														
		you learned	14 13	0	0	0	0	3	0		****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	3.86	****		
	Were all students actively encouraged to participa Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss						0	0	0	4	0		****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
			_	en discussion	13	0	0	0	0	4	0			****	4.41	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were sp	ecial tech	nniques succes	sstul		13	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.18	3.95	3.75	****
		Laborat	orv															
1. Did the	lab incre	ease understar	-	e material	4	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	200/ 221	3.26	3.71	4.16	4.05	3.38
			_	nd information	4	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	169/ 243	3.85	4.03	4.12	4.08	3.92
_	_	aterials avail	_		4	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	172/ 212	3.86	4.08	4.40	4.43	3.92
	_	ructor provide			4	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	111/ 209	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.46
		for lab repo			4	2	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	380/ 555	3.78	4.19	4.29	4.14	4.09
	-	-																
		Seminar																
5. Were cr	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did con	ferences l	nelp you carry		activities	14	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.50	3.80	3.68	3.51	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı											
Credits Ea	xpected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	oe .			Majors	;			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.								<i>r</i> es				0	#### - I				_	ſh
	P 0											_	response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	2						
		? 1																

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0111 University of Maryland BASIC PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: DOTSON, AMANDA Fall 2008 Enrollment: 20

Title

Questionnaires: 2

Page 1306 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions		MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 1	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Quesciona	, 															
		General	L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1498/1649	3.99	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.50
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1124/1648	3.92	4.07	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.27	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1441/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	3.93	3.91	4.10	3.86	5.00
		g system clearly	_	ned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1387/1623	4.03	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.50
	-	was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1646		4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	3.57	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lectures	-	repared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	4.39	4.52	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem intere	_	-	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1572		4.65	4.70	4.64	5.00
	as lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	1	0	0		1496/1564	3.89	4.20	4.28	4.20	3.00
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.09	4.21	4.29	4.20	5.00
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	4.09	4.04	3.98	3.86	5.00
		_																
		Laborat	-						_	_								
		crease understar			0	0	0	0	1	0	1		129/ 221		3.71	4.16	4.05	4.00
_	_	_	_	round information	0		0	0	0	1	1		65/ 243		4.03	4.12	4.08	4.50
				r lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1 2				4.08	4.40	4.43	
4. Dia the	e lab ins	structor provide	e assist	ance	U	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/ 209	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.38	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
G 11		g gp.		1 . 1				_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0	2.1							_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Other						2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0112
Title BASIC PHYSICS I

Instructor: DIAO, LIJUN

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1307 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions							_	ncies		_		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions	; 		NR	NA		2	3 	4	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		General																
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	4	4	3	3	2	2.69	1635/1649	3.99	4.19	4.28	4.11	2.69
		ctor make clear			0	0	4	3	2	7	0	2.75	1617/1648	3.92	4.07	4.23	4.16	2.75
3. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	1	2	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1222/1375	4.27	4.15	4.27	4.10	3.46
4. Did oth	er evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	6	1	4	1	3	1	2.90	1554/1595	3.91	4.05	4.20	4.03	2.90
5. Did ass	igned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1411/1533	3.71	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.1
				o what you learned	1	7	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1428/1512	3.93	3.91	4.10	3.86	3.0
. Was the	grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	2	4	2	1	7	3.44	1419/1623	4.03	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.4
. How man	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.99	4.92	4.69	4.67	5.0
. How wou	ld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	6	3	2	1	1	2.08	1609/1621	3.57	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.0
		Lecture	2															
. Were th	e instru	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	4	0	3	1	1	3	4	3.33	1488/1568	4.39	4.52	4.43	4.39	3.3
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	4	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1517/1572	4.51	4.65	4.70	4.64	3.7
. Was lec	ture mat	terial presented	l and e	explained clearly	4	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1478/1564	3.89	4.20	4.28	4.20	3.1
. Did the	lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	4	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1456/1559	4.09	4.21	4.29	4.20	3.1
. Did aud	iovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	4	3	2	1	3	0	3	3.11	1204/1352	4.09	4.04	3.98	3.86	3.1
		Laborat	ory															
. Did the	lab inc	crease understar	ding c	of the material	3	0	6	3	3	1	0	1.92	220/ 221	3.26	3.71	4.16	4.05	1.9
				ground information	3	0	4	1	3	5	0	2.69	231/ 243	3.85	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.6
				or lab activities	3	0	1	4	4	3	1	2.92	212/ 212	3.86	4.08	4.40	4.43	2.9
		structor provide			3	0	5	5	2	1	0	1.92	209/ 209	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.38	1.9
. Were re	quiremer	nts for lab repo	rts cl	early specified	3	1	2	4	3	1	2	2.75	506/ 555	3.78	4.19	4.29	4.14	2.7
		Seminar																
. Were cr	iteria f	for grading made	clear		13	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	4.13	3.68	3.54	***
		Field V	lork															
5. Did con	ferences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	12	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.50	3.80	3.68	3.51	3.5
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		 Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			=			J						3 -		_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	1h
	-	· · · · ·		P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.	her				1	1			٠- ر - ٠٠			
				2 1							_							

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101 Title

BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 8 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1308 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3 88	1295/1649	3.88	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	1		1254/1648	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.16	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	1		1112/1375	3.88	4.15	4.27	4.10	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	1	1	0		1583/1595	3.42	4.05	4.20	4.03	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	1		1200/1533	3.67	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	1	0		1494/1512	3.11	3.91	4.10	3.86	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	815/1623	4.46	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646		4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	5	0		1345/1621			4.06	3.96	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Ü	Ü	J	-	2	3	Ü	3.30	1313/1021	3.33	3.00	1.00	3.50	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	699/1568		4.52	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	4		1241/1572		4.65	4.70	4.64	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	812/1564		4.20	4.28	4.20	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25			4.21	4.29	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	515/1352	4.29	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.46
Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.41	4.30	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	192/ 221	3.68	3.71	4.16	4.05	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	192/ 221	4.05	4.03	4.12	4.03	4.25
	-	0			1									
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	-	0	1	0	5 2	1 5	3.75	188/ 212		4.08	4.40	4.43	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0 2	0		-		_	4.38	121/ 209	3.97	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	293/ 555	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.14	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	***	4.67	4.47	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.80		3.51	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
o. Were there enough proctors for all the students	,	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 110			3.99	3.03	

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1308 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101

Title BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: DOTSON, AMANDA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 8

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1309 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	anier	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1295/1649	3.88	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1254/1648	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.16	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1112/1375	3.88	4.15	4.27	4.10	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	1	1	0		1583/1595	3.42	4.05	4.20	4.03	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1200/1533	3.67	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1494/1512	3.11	3.91	4.10	3.86	2.50
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	815/1623	4.46	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	4.78	4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1288/1621	3.55	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	852/1568	4.22	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1463/1572	4.36	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1127/1564	3.92	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	966/1559	4.00	4.21	4.29	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.29	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.46
Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368	***	4.41	4.30	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	192/ 221	3.68	3.71	4.16	4.05	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	128/ 243	4.05	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	188/ 212	3.95	4.08	4.40	4.43	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	121/ 209	3.95	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	293 / 555	4.32	4.19	4.29		4.50
3. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	U	2	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	293/ 333	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.14	4.50
Seminar	7	0	0	0	0	-	0	4 00	**** / OO		4 67	4 54	4 21	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.47	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.80	3.68	3.51	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101 Title

BASIC PHYSICS II

Instructor: DOTSON, AMANDA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 8 Baltimore County

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1309 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0102 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title BASIC PHYSICS II Instructor: YOU, HAO (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1310

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA		_	ncies 3		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	
D. 1		General	6	0	0	-	•			2	2 00	1005/1640	2 00	4 10	4 00	4 11	2 6
			s from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	3		1287/1649		4.19	4.28	4.11	
			he expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1			1408/1648		4.07	4.23	4.16	3.6
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1			950/1375		4.15	4.27	4.10	4.
			he expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	0			722/1595			4.20	4.03	
			e to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3			1045/1533				3.87	
			oute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3			1143/1512				3.86	
	-	g system clearly	-	0	0	-	0	1	1			321/1623			4.16	4.08	
		was class cancel		0	0	1	0	0	0			1148/1646					
How wo	uld you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1429/1621	3.55	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.
		Lecture															
		uctor's lectures		2	0	1	0	1	0	5		1205/1568			4.43		3.
			ted in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1435/1572	4.36	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.
		-	and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	2			1316/1564					3.
		es contribute to		2	0	1	1	1	0			1301/1559					
Did au	diovisua	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	690/1352	4.29	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.
		Discussi	on														
Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribut	e to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	3.86	* *
Were a	ll stude	nts actively enco	uraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	* *
Did th	e instru	ctor encourage fa	ir and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1368	****	4.41	4.30	4.01	* *
		Laborato	ry														
. Did th	e lab in	crease understand	ing of the material	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	163/ 221	3.68	3.71	4.16	4.05	3.
Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate	background information	2	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	178/ 243	4.05	4.03	4.12	4.08	3.
Were n	ecessary	materials availa	ble for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	144/ 212	3.95	4.08	4.40	4.43	4.
Did th	e lab in	structor provide	assistance	2	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	181/ 209	3.97	4.13	4.35	4.38	3.
Were r	equireme	nts for lab repor	ts clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	374/ 555	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.14	4.
		Seminar															
Were c	riteria	for grading made	clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.54	* *
		Field Wo															
Did co	nference	s help you carry	out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	4.00	3.80	3.68	3.51	**
			Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
redits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 2		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ijor	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55	0		0 B 1						J ·						3		
6-83	1		0 C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2 D 0													3	
rad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ηh
	-		P 0									respons				_	
			I O		Ot.1	her					4						
			? 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0102 University of Maryland Page 1311
Title BASIC PHYSICS II Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Title BASIC PHYSICS II Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 18

Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 1 4 3 3.89 1287/1649 3.88 4.19 4.28 4.11 3.89 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 2 1 4 3.67 1408/1648 3.77 4.07 4.23 4.16 3.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 1 4 4.00 950/1375 3.88 4.15 4.27 4.10 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 2 0 4 4.33 722/1595 3.42 4.05 4.20 4.03 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 2 3 3 3.78 1045/1533 3.67 3.88 4.04 3.87 3.78 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 1143/1512 3.11 3.91 4.10 3.86 3.71 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 321/1623 4.46 4.32 4.16 4.08 4.67 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 0 0 8 4.56 1148/1646 4.78 4.92 4.69 4.67 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 1192/1621 3.55 3.86 4.06 3.96 3.54 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 2 0 2 3.60 1440/1568 4.22 4.52 4.43 4.39 3.87 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 840/1572 4.36 4.65 4.70 4.64 4.47 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 1360/1564 3.92 4.20 4.28 4.20 3.66 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 1246/1559 4.00 4.21 4.29 4.20 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 515/1352 4.29 4.04 3.98 3.86 4.13 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.08 3.86 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.29 4.03 \*\*\*\* 1 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 4.41 4.30 4.01 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 163/221 3.68 3.71 4.16 4.05 3.86 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 1 0 2 0 4 3.86 178/243 4.05 4.03 4.12 4.08 3.86 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 2 0 0 2 3 3.57 181/209 3.97 4.13 4.35 4.38 3.57 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 374/555 4.32 4.19 4.29 4.14 4.14 Seminar 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 288 \*\*\*\* 4.13 3.68 3.54 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 312 4.00 3.80 3.68 3.51 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Reasons Type Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors 

 00-27
 0
 0.00-0.99
 0
 A
 2
 Required for Major

 28-55
 0
 1.00-1.99
 0
 B
 1

 56-83
 1
 2.00-2.99
 0
 C
 2
 General

 84-150
 3
 3.00-3.49
 2
 D
 0

 Grad.
 0
 3.50-4.00
 3
 F
 0
 Electives

 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 1 Under-grad 9 Non-major 9 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other

? 0

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL T

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 5

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1312 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1540/1649	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1591/1648	3.47	4.07	4.23	4.16	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.26	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1537/1595	3.35	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1531/1533	2.40	3.88	4.04	3.87	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1505/1512	2.78	3.91	4.10	3.86	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.52	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.67	****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1610/1621	2.71	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1568	4.53	4.52	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1572	4.50	4.65	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1564	3.68	4.20	4.28	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1559	3.84	4.21	4.29	4.20	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	3.84	4.04	3.98	3.86	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1368	****	4.41	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	4.18	3.95	3.75	****

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

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: CUI, LILI

Enrollment: 310
Questionnaires: 121

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1313 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						₽×	00110	ncie			Tng	tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
		Ouestions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	om this course	4	0	2	7	27	37	44	3.97	1209/1649	3.65	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.97
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear the ex	pected goals	4	0	2	14	19	37	45	3.93	1197/1648	3.47	4.07	4.23	4.16	3.93
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect the e	expected goals	4	0	4	8	15	44	46	4.03	943/1375	4.26	4.15	4.27	4.10	4.03
		ations reflect the ex		5	41	5	6	18	24	22		1317/1595		4.05	4.20	4.03	3.69
	_	eadings contribute to	-	6	21	6	8	17	30	33		1017/1533		3.88	4.04	3.87	3.81
		signments contribute t	-		55	3	8	13	24	12		1227/1512		3.91	4.10	3.86	3.57
		g system clearly expla	ined	6	1	4	5	22	35	48		1014/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.04
	-	was class cancelled		5	0	0	0	0		116	5.00	1/1646		4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	19	1	3	15	29	44	10	3.43	1393/1621	2.71	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.43
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	4	0	1	1	9	30	76	4.53	827/1568	4.53	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.53
		ctor seem interested i		4	0	1	2	5	38	71		1241/1572		4.65	4.70	4.64	4.50
		erial presented and e	_	4	0	7	9	28	44	29		1332/1564		4.20	4.28	4.20	3.68
		es contribute to what		4	0	8	6	21	44	38	3.84	1231/1559	3.84	4.21	4.29	4.20	3.84
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	4	7	8	6	25	28	43	3.84	860/1352	3.84	4.04	3.98	3.86	3.84
1 541		Discussion		107	0	2	0	2	4	_	2 00	**** /1 204		4 00	4 00	2.06	****
		ussions contribute to	_	107	0	3	2	3	4	2		****/1384			4.08	3.86	****
		nts actively encourage		106	0	2	2	0	3	8		****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
		ctor encourage fair an echniques successful	d open discussion	106 105	5	2	1	3 4	0	6 4		****/1368 ****/ 948		4.41	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were s	pecial te	eciniques successiui		105	5	2	Т	4	U	4	3.27	/ 940		4.10	3.95	3.75	
		Laboratory															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understanding o	of the material	117	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	3.71	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequate back	ground information	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
	_	materials available f		120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	4.08	4.40	4.43	****
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab reports cl	early specified	115	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.19	4.29	4.14	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant to the	announced theme	118	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	****
		ctor available for ind		120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 85		4.67	4.47	4.30	****
		ojects contribute to		120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 81		4.56	4.43	4.39	****
												,					
		Field Work				_											
I. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribute to w	nat you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
			Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	5
													- 				
00-27 28-55	14 23	0.00-0.99 1 1.00-1.99 0	A 35 B 34		Red	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	îs	4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55 56-83	23 13	2.00-2.99 11	в 34 С 26		000	no	1				0	IIndon	~~d 1^	.1	Mor	mo i or	116
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 11	D 6		Gei	nera	1				U	Under-g	rau 12	Ι. Τ	non-	-major	TΤΩ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 27	Б 6 F 0		. רק	ecti	1700				3	#### -	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00 27	P 0		E.T.	CCLI	ves				ے	respons				_	111
			I O		∩+1	her				c	5	respoils	CD LU L	c argi	ıııcal	10	
			? 3		ULI	TTCT				3							
			; 3														

Course-Section: PHYS 121H 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS Baltimore County

Title INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS Baltimore Count Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1314

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	1	2	2	5	3.21	1569/1649	3.21	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1569/1648	3.21	4.07	4.23	4.16	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	1	1	4	2	2.77	1353/1375	2.77	4.15	4.27	4.10	2.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	1482/1595	3.30	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	1310/1533	3.42	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	1498/1512	2.40	3.91	4.10	3.86	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.92	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	5	1	2	3	2	2.69	1568/1621	3.55	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	1	2	6	3.50	1460/1568	4.06	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	2	2	6	3.57	1531/1572	4.29	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	0	3	2	4	3.00	1496/1564	3.88	4.20	4.28	4.20	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	2	1	4	2.71	1520/1559	3.73	4.21	4.29	4.20	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	4	0	1	1	4	3.10	1207/1352	3.10	4.04	3.98	3.86	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	Ο	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	697/1384	4.21	4.22	4.08	3.86	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	757/1382		4.44	4.29	4.03	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	784/1368	4.36	4.41	4.30	4.01	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	560/ 948		4.18	3.95	3.75	3.85
T. A														
Laboratory	1.0	0	•	0	0	•	_	F 00	****	als als als als	4 10	4 00	4 1 4	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	U	0	0	U	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.19	4.29	4.14	***

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<b>L</b>	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	Α	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-	-	-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121H 0101 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS Instructor: GEORGE, IAN (Instr. B) Fall 2008

0

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 15

C+11202+	Comman	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire

Page 1315

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies				tructor	Course	_		Level	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	4	1	2	2	5	3.21	1569/1649	3.21	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.21
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	3	1	3	4	3		1569/1648		4.07	4.23	4.16	3.21
		uestions reflec			1	1	5	1	1	4	2	2.77	1353/1375	2.77	4.15	4.27	4.10	2.77
		uations reflect			1	4	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	1482/1595	3.30	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.30
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	1310/1533	3.42	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.42
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	9	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	1498/1512	2.40	3.91	4.10	3.86	2.40
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.92	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	497/1621	3.55	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.55
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	699/1568	4.06	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.06
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	n the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	4.29	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.29
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	342/1564	3.88	4.20	4.28	4.20	3.88
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1559	3.73	4.21	4.29	4.20	3.73
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1352	3.10	4.04	3.98	3.86	3.10
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	697/1384	4.21	4.22	4.08	3.86	4.21
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	757/1382	4.36	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.36
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	784/1368	4.36	4.41	4.30	4.01	4.36
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	560/ 948	3.85	4.18	3.95	3.75	3.85
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.19	4.29	4.14	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		<i>a</i>		,				0	77	1 1	_	37		11
56-83	2 0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1 D 1		Ger	nera.	Т				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	11
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49	0 3	D 1 F 1		- רות	ectiv					1	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	no+	020000	.h
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	3	P 0		ъ⊥€	=CLT,	v C S				1	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	ner				1	1	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcan	I C	
				Ι υ		ocr	ier.				1	Τ.						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0102

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: CUI, LILI

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00 23

0

0

0

Ρ

I

Enrollment: 214
Questionnaires: 105

Fall 2008

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1316 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	
	General															
l Did vou gain ne	ew insights,skills from this	course	1	0	1	7	30	33	33	3 87	1303/1649	3.87	4.19	4.28	4.11	3.8
	ctor make clear the expected		1	0	4	10	36	28	26		1451/1648		4.07	4.23	4.16	
	uestions reflect the expected	-	3	0	6	9	34	27	26		1184/1375		4.15	4.27	4.10	
	uations reflect the expected		3	41	3	4	19	16	19		1300/1595		4.05	4.20	4.03	
	eadings contribute to what you		3	21	5	8	25	20	23		1186/1533			4.04	3.87	
	signments contribute to what		3	35	5	11	12	18	21		1214/1512		3.91	4.10	3.86	
	g system clearly explained	you rourned	2	0	0	5	17	28	53	4.25	815/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	
	was class cancelled		3	0	0	0	0	0	102	5.00	1/1646		4.92	4.69	4.67	5.
	grade the overall teaching ef	fectiveness	14	0	10	15	35	22	9	3.05	1496/1621	3.05	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.
	Lecture															
. Were the instr	uctor's lectures well prepared	d	4	0	0	5	9	32	55	4.36	1031/1568	4.36	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.
. Did the instru	ctor seem interested in the s	ubject	5	0	0	4	12	28	56	4.36	1346/1572	4.36	4.65	4.70	4.64	4.
. Was lecture mat	terial presented and explained	d clearly	6	0	8	18	30	20	23	3.32	1443/1564	3.32	4.20	4.28	4.20	3.
. Did the lecture	es contribute to what you lea:	rned	5	1	8	10	26	27	28	3.58	1351/1559	3.58	4.21	4.29	4.20	3.
. Did audiovisua	l techniques enhance your und	erstanding	10	5	3	7	12	28	40	4.06	661/1352	4.06	4.04	3.98	3.86	4.
	Discussion															
. Did class disc	ussions contribute to what you	u learned	63	0	6	10	9	6	11	3.14	1232/1384	3.14	4.22	4.08	3.86	3
Were all stude	nts actively encouraged to par	rticipate	63	0	2	7	7	12	14	3.69	1132/1382	3.69	4.44	4.29	4.03	3
Did the instru	ctor encourage fair and open o	discussion	63	0	3	4	7	14	14	3.76	1090/1368	3.76	4.41	4.30	4.01	3
. Were special to	echniques successful		62	8	5	3	3	7	17	3.80	578/ 948	3.80	4.18	3.95	3.75	3.
	Laboratory															
	crease understanding of the ma		103	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.71	4.16	4.05	* *
	ded with adequate background :			0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 243		4.03	4.12	4.08	* *
	materials available for lab	activities		0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 212		4.08	4.40	4.43	* *
	structor provide assistance		103	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 209		4.13	4.35	4.38	* *
. Were requiremen	nts for lab reports clearly s	pecified	83	0	0	2	6	1	13	4.14	****/ 555	***	4.19	4.29	4.14	* *
	Seminar												4 40		0 = 4	
. Were criteria	for grading made clear		93	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	****/ 288	***	4.13	3.68	3.54	* *
D. 1	Field Work		0.5	0	0	0	0	1.0	0	4 10	**** / 210	als als als als	2 00	2 60	2 51	* *
. Did conferences	s help you carry out field ac	tivities	85	0	0	0	0	18	2	4.10	****/ 312	****	3.80	3.68	3.51	^ ′
	Self Paced															
. Did self-paced	system contribute to what you	u learned	104	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	* *
. Did study ques	tions make clear the expected	goal	104	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	*:
Were your conta	acts with the instructor help:	ful	104	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	**
		Frequ	ıency	Dis Dis	trib	utic	n									
redits Earned	Cum. GPA Expe	cted Grades				R∈	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3
 00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	 A 18		 Re	auir	ed f	or M	aior		3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55 23		B 49		110	2011	I		ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	~	-	SI dadd	-	-	٠٠٠٠) د	-	
56-83 13	2.00-2.99 16	C 18		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 10	5	Non-	-major	10

Electives

Other

79

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0101
Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L Baltimore Cour

I 0

?

0

Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1317 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Questions					NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 110	aain na	Genera w insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	433/1649	4.38	4.19	4.28	4.11	4.67
		etor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1648	4.58	4.19	4.23	4.11	4.50
		estions reflec			2	2	0	0	0	1		4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.15	4.27		4.50
	_	ations reflect			1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595		4.05	4.20	4.03	4.75
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	815/1533		3.88	4.04		4.00
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.50			3.91			4.50
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	4		4.33	720/1623		4.32	4.16		4.33
		was class canc		21100	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69		5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	914/1621				3.96	
		Tt	_															
1 Wome +	ho inatm	Lectur actor's lecture		nunnaund	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.88	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.75
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.75	931/1572		4.65	4.43	4.64	
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.73	, -		4.20	4.28	4.20	4.50
					2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50			4.21	4.29		4.50
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	1	2	-	3.67					3.86	
3. 21a aa	5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						ŭ	ŭ	_	_	Ü	3.07	3,0,1332	1.05	1.01	3.70	3.00	3.07
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 221	4.33	3.71	4.16	4.05	5.00
				ground information	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	58/ 243	4.41	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.60
				for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 212		4.08	4.40	4.43	5.00
		structor provid			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	323/ 555	4.37	4.19	4.29	4.14	4.40
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out	field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	3.80	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	ution	า									
				_														
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				<del>-</del> ^		0 + 1						2						

Other

3

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0103

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L

GOUGOUSI, THEOD Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2008 15

Page 1318 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			•		_	_				4 00		4 00		4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	4		1129/1649		4.19	4.28	4.11	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	362/1648	4.58	4.07	4.23	4.16	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Ţ	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.71	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	4	2		1166/1533	3.81	3.88	4.04	3.87	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	687/1512		3.91	4.10	3.86	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	220/1623	4.54	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646		4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	Τ	6	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	Λ	8	5.00	1/1568	4.88	4.52	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	4.88	4.65	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	939/1564		4.20	4.70	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	804/1559		4.21	4.29	4.20	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352		4.04	3.98		4.40
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	-	J	U	U		_	5	1.10	333/1332	1.03	1.01	3.90	3.00	1.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	4.41	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.18	3.95	3.75	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	181/ 221	4.33	3.71	4.16	4.05	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	135/ 243	4.41	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	32/ 212	4.94	4.08	4.40	4.43	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	338/ 555	4.37	4.19	4.29	4.14	4.33
- · · ·														

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: MARTINS, JOSE

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 23

FINS, JOSE F

University of Maryland Page 1319
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionna	aire
--------------------------------------	------

Frequencies

						P L	eque	TICTE	5		TIID	LIUCLUI	COULSE	: Debr	OPIDC	пелет	Sect
		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		General															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	617/1649	4.52	4.19	4.28	4.29	4.52
		ctor make clear the e		0	0	1	1	4	13			1326/1648	3.78	4.07		4.25	3.78
		estions reflect the	-	0	0	0	3	2	13			1055/1375			4.27		
	_	lations reflect the e	_	0	7	0	1	4	10			1323/1595		4.05		4.22	
		eadings contribute to		0	0	1	0	4	9			761/1533			4.04	4.04	4.09
	-	signments contribute	_	0	7	1	0	6	4	5	3.75	1119/1512	3.75	3.91	4.10		3.75
		g system clearly expl		0	0	0	1	7	6	9		1029/1623	4.00		4.16	4.21	
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1646	5.00		4.69	4.63	5.00
		grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1123/1621	3.83	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.83
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	4	6	7	5	3.59	1442/1568	3.59	4.52	4.43	4.39	3.59
		ctor seem interested		2	0	0	0	1				912/1572			4.70	4.73	
		terial presented and		2	0	1	1	3	7			1109/1564			4.28	4.27	
		es contribute to what		2	0	0	2	4	6			1102/1559		4.21		4.33	
		L techniques enhance		2	1	0	2	4	7	-		754/1352					
o. Dia aa	arovibua:	e ccominques emianee	your understanding	-	_	Ü	-	•	,	,	3.75	75171552	3.33	1.01	3.70	1.07	3.75
ı Didalı	ogg digg	Discussion ussions contribute to	what way learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	3.99	***1
		nts actively encourag		21	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1382		4.22	4.08	4.19	***
			21	0	0	0	0	1			****/1368	****	4.41	4.29	4.19	***	
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	1	0	0		****/ 948		4.18	3.95	3.89	****
4. Were S	. Were special techniques successful						U		U	U	3.00	""""/ 940		4.10	3.95	3.09	
		Laboratory															
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	12	0	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.19	4.29	4.33	4.00
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made clea	r	18	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.65	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	16	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.80	3.68	3.59	3.71
		Self Paced															
5. Were tl	here enou	igh proctors for all	the students	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.72	****
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	5	
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9						ed f	 or M			0	Graduat		0	Majo		13
28-55							eu I	OT IM	ajui	۵	U	Graduat	<b>C</b>	U	ma J	) <u>T</u>	13
26-33 56-83							1				3	Under-q	rad ?	:3	Non	-major	10
84-150							ι⊥				3	onder-g.	rau 2	٥	MOI1-	-ıııa JOE	10
							****				2	и и и и и	Moona +	homo -		- 0000:	-h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00 10	= *		EI	ecti	ves				4	#### - 1				_	) I I
	- · · ·									-	0	respons	es to D	e sigr	ııııcar	16	
			I 0		Οt	her				1	.8						
			? 2														

Course-Section: PHYS 303 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1320 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH
Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN

Enrollment: 17
Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 710/1649 4.45 4.19 4.28 4.27 4.45 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 710/1649 4.45 4.19 4.28 4.27 4.45 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 756/1648 4.36 4.07 4.23 4.18 4.36 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 704/1375 4.36 4.15 4.27 4.22 4.36 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 497/1595 4.50 4.05 4.20 4.21 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 2 5 4.00 815/1533 4.00 3.88 4.04 4.05 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/1512 \*\*\*\* 3.91 4.10 4.11 \*\*\*\* 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 568/1623 4.45 4.32 4.16 4.08 4.45 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.92 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 442/1621 4.45 3.86 4.06 4.02 4.45 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 535/1568 4.73 4.52 4.43 4.39 4.73 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 815/1572 4.82 4.65 4.70 4.64 4.82 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 511/1564 4.64 4.20 4.28 4.25 4.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 434/1559 4.73 4.21 4.29 4.23 4.73 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 208/1352 4.67 4.04 3.98 3.97 4.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 655/1384 4.29 4.22 4.08 4.11 4.29 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 899/1382 4.14 4.44 4.29 4.37 4.14 4. Were special techniques successful 4 6 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 4.18 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\* 555 \*\*\*\* 4.19 4.29 4.22 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	ned Cum. GPA			l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				2	2						

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title OPTICS LABORATORY Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1321 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1648	4.92	4.07	4.23	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.15	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1595	4.72	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	454/1533	4.51	3.88	4.04	4.05	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	310/1512	4.63	3.91	4.10	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1623	4.92	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1621	4.94	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	442/1568	4.89	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	310/1564	4.89	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	512/1559	4.75	4.21	4.29	4.23	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1352	4.75	4.04	3.98	3.97	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	284/1384	4.69	4.22	4.08	4.11	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	696/1382	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	295/1368	4.94	4.41	4.30	4.39	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	4.80	4.18	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	3.71	4.16	4.07	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.03	4.12	3.89	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 212	4.92	4.08	4.40	4.21	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.12	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/ 555	4.62	4.19	4.29	4.22	4.90
Frequ	.ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0102 University of Mary Title OPTICS LABORATORY Baltimore Count Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B Fall 2008

Enrollment:
Questionnaires:

University of Maryland Page 1322
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

6 Student Course Evaluation Qu	Questionnaire
--------------------------------	---------------

				Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1 Did you gain new i	nsights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.27	5.00
1 3	make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.92	4.07	4.23	4.18	4.83
	ons reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.72	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.67
	ngs contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.51	3.88	4.04	4.05	4.60
_	ments contribute to what you learned	0 E	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.63	3.91	4.10	4.11	4.67
7. Was the grading sy	stem clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1623	4.92	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.83
8. How many times was	class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grad	le the overall teaching effectivenes	3 1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1621	4.94	3.86	4.06	4.02	5.00
	T a whomas														
1 Works the instructe	Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1 /1 5 6 0	4.89	4 E2	4.43	1 20	5.00
	or's lectures well prepared seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6 6	5.00	1/1568 1/1572	5.00	4.52 4.65	4.43	4.39	5.00
	al presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/15/2	4.89	4.05	4.70	4.04	5.00
4. Did the lectures of	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual te	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	4.75	4.04	3.98	3.97	5.00	
J. Dia addiovisual co	O	3	O	O	O	O	3	3.00	1/1332	1.75	1.01	3.70	3.57	3.00	
	Discussion														
<ol> <li>Did class discussi</li> </ol>	ons contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.69	4.22	4.08	4.11	4.67
	actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.37	5.00
	encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	4.94	4.41	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techn	iques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.18	3.95	4.00	4.80
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increa	use understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	3.71	4.16	4.07	5.00
	with adequate background information	-	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.03	4.12	3.89	5.00
2 2	erials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	43/ 212	4.92	4.08	4.40	4.21	4.83
4. Did the lab instru	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.12	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified				0	0	1	2	3	4.33	338/ 555	4.62	4.19	4.29	4.22	4.33
Frequ				trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	5			Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors		

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

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101 University of Maryland Title MODERN PHYSICS LAB Baltimore County WU, EN-SHINN Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

8

Fall 2008

Page 1323 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student (	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fr	equer	ncies	:		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1. Did v	zou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1589/1649	3.13	4.19	4.28	4.27	3.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	1	4	0	1		1628/1648	2.63	4.07	4.23	4.18	2.63
		estions reflec		_	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1375		4.15	4.27	4.22	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1537/1595	3.00	4.05	4.20	4.21	3.00
				what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1483/1533	2.86	3.88	4.04	4.05	2.86
				to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3			1309/1512		3.91	4.10	4.11	3.43
		system clearl		-	0	1	0	0	4	1			1293/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	3.71
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	1	0			913/1646		4.92	4.69	4.67	
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	2	1	2	1			1566/1621				4.02	
		Lectur	re															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1506/1568	3.14	4.52	4.43	4.39	3.14
		ctor seem inter			1	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1502/1572	3.86	4.65	4.70	4.64	3.86
				explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1452/1564	3.29	4.20	4.28	4.25	3.29
		es contribute t			1	0	4	0	2	1	0	2.00	1550/1559	2.00	4.21	4.29	4.23	2.00
				your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	***	4.04	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ssions contrib	oute to	what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1335/1384	2.67	4.22	4.08	4.11	2.67
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	5	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1363/1368	1.67	4.41	4.30	4.39	1.67
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	essful		5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.18	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did t	the lab ind	rease understa	nding (	of the material	0	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	184/ 221	3.63	3.71	4.16	4.07	3.63
2. Were	you provid	ded with adequa	ite bac	kground information	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	237/ 243	2.63	4.03	4.12	3.89	2.63
3. Were	necessary	materials avai	lable :	for lab activities	0	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	211/ 212	3.00	4.08	4.40	4.21	3.00
4. Did t	the lab ins	structor provid	le assi:	stance	0	0	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	208/ 209	2.50	4.13	4.35	4.12	2.50
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	0	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	4.19	4.29	4.22	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
		0 00 0 00	0	 л 1							. – – –	·	Cwadaat					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1 B 5		кес	quir	ed fo	T. MS	ijors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	ıτ	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	-	В 5 С 1		<b>a</b>		1				0	TTm d a se		0	Mar		2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	T				U	Under-g	rau	8	NOU-	major	2

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

Course-Section: PHYS 407 0101 University of Maryland Title ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1324

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	238/1649	4.85	4.19	4.28	4.50	4.85
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	4		4.54	521/1648	4.54	4.07	4.23	4.36	4.54
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	521/1375	4.54	4.15	4.27	4.48	4.54
	_	uations reflect		1 3	1	3	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	759/1595	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.30
				what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	624/1533	4.25	3.88	4.04	4.14	4.25
	_	-		to what you learned	1	3	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	835/1512	4.10	3.91	4.10	4.26	4.10
		g system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	210/1623	4.77	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.77
		was class cance			1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.92	4.69	4.71	4.92
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	261/1621			4.06	4.24	4.64
		Lecture																
1 Were t	the instri	nctor's lectures		nrenared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	461/1568	4.77	4.52	4.43	4.54	4.77
		ctor seem inter		1 1	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.77	473/1572		4.65	4.70	4.79	4.77
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	702/1564		4.20	4.70	4.40	4.46
		es contribute to			1	1	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	818/1559	4.42	4.21	4.29	4.41	4.42
				your understanding	3	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1352		4.04	3.98	4.07	****
5. Did at	uuiovisuai	r techniques em	iance y	Your understanding	3	2	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/1352		4.04	3.90	4.07	
		Discuss	sion															
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.22	4.08	4.35	4.50
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did th	he instruc	ctor encourage f	fair ar	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.41	4.30	4.58	4.75
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.18	3.95	4.31	****
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were 1	requiremer		-	learly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.19	4.29	4.41	****
				Frequ	onat	, Diet	-rib	1+ 1 01	n									
				rrequ	terrey	DIS		10101	.1									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	guire	ed f	or Ma	jor	`====	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			-						3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 5		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	rh
				P 0									respons	es to h	e siar	ificar	ıt.	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 480 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title TECH IN THEORETICAL PH
Instructor: GEORGANOPOULOS,

Enrollment: 21 Ouestionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1325 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 459/1649 4.64 4.19 4.28 4.50 4.64 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 5 3 6 4.07 1082/1648 4.07 4.07 4.23 4.36 4.07 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 2 8 4.29 780/1375 4.29 4.15 4.27 4.48 4.29 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 5 4 4.44 580/1595 4.44 4.05 4.20 4.36 4.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 311/1533 4.57 3.88 4.04 4.14 4.57 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 5 5 4.50 380/1512 4.50 3.91 4.10 4.26 4.507. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 97/1623 4.93 4.32 4.16 4.27 4.93 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 531/1646 4.93 4.92 4.69 4.71 4.93 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 789/1621 4.17 3.86 4.06 4.24 4.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 667/1568 4.64 4.52 4.43 4.54 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 11 \quad 4.71 \quad 1003/1572 \quad 4.71 \quad 4.65 \quad 4.70 \quad 4.79 \quad 4.71 \quad 4$ 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 2 1 1 10 4.36 833/1564 4.36 4.20 4.28 4.40 4.36 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 945/1559 4.29 4.21 4.29 4.41 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 0 1 0 2 4 4.29 495/1352 4.29 4.04 3.98 4.07 4.29 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1 3 0 4 3.88 901/1384 3.88 4.22 4.08 4.35 3.88 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 831/1382 4.25 4.44 4.29 4.56 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  $6 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 4 \ 4 \ 4.50 \ 654/1368 \ 4.50 \ 4.41 \ 4.30 \ 4.58 \ 4.50$ 4. Were special techniques successful 6 5 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 \*\*\*\* 948 \*\*\*\* 4.18 3.95 4.31 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 221 \*\*\*\* 3.71 4.16 4.73 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 243 \*\*\*\* 4.03 4.12 4.61 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 212 \*\*\*\* 4.08 4.40 4.57 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 209 \*\*\*\* 4.13 4.35 4.63 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.19 4.29 4.41 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ 1 0.00-0.99 2 A 5 00-27 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 C 0 General Under-grad 7 Non-major 8 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 0 3.00-3.49 0 3.50-4.00 1 D 0 84-150 1 F 0 Electives 0 Grad. #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

13

I 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 1326

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHYS 601 0101

QUANTUM MECHANICS

FRANSON, JAMES

Title

Instructor:

								_	ncies				cructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	;		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.19	4.28	4.46	4.60
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.34	4.20
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	4	11		321/1375	4.73	4.15	4.27	4.44	4.73
		uations reflect			1	5	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.05	4.20	4.35	4.50
		eadings contribu			1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	241/1533	4.67	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.67
	_	-		what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1512	4.77	3.91	4.10	4.35	4.77
7. Was th	ne gradino	g system clearly	explai	ned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	241/1623	4.73	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.73
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.81	5.00
	-			ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	687/1621	4.25	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.25
		Lecture	:															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	690/1572	4.87	4.65	4.70	4.83	4.87
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	l and ex	plained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	620/1564	4.53	4.20	4.28	4.41	4.53
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.21	4.29	4.41	4.67
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	2	3	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	872/1352	3.82	4.04	3.98	4.10	3.82
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	4	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	767/1384	4.08	4.22	4.08	4.30	4.08
		nts actively end			4	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	927/1382	4.08	4.44	4.29	4.52	4.08
				open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	742/1368	4.42	4.41	4.30	4.56	4.42
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful	-	4	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	****	4.18	3.95	4.03	****
		Laborat	ory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	e backg	round information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.61	****
4. Did th	e lab ins	structor provide	assist	ance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.13	4.35	4.80	****
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.67	4.54	4.63	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A 8		Red	quire	ea io	or Ma	Jor	S	U	Graduat	e	9	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		~		,				-	1	,	-			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera.	L				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0 F 0								1			1			1-
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	1	- *		上1	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	11
						O+1	h o				-	2	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcar	IL.	
				- *		Utl	ner				Т	.2						
				? 1														

#### Course-Section: PHYS 602 0101 University of Maryland Page 1327 Title STATISTICAL MECHANICS Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 4

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.19	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.07	4.23	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1208/1375	3.50	4.15	4.27	4.44	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.35	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1366/1533	3.25	3.88	4.04	4.28	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1512	4.25	3.91	4.10	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.50	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	n	n	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572		4.65	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	n	n	n	1	3	4.75	342/1564		4.20	4.28	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	n	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559		4.21	4.29	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352		4.04	3.98	4.10	4.67

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 604 0101 University of Maryland Page 1328
Title SOLID STATE I Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 6

Ouestionnaires:	5	Student Cou	irce Evalua	tion Ou	astionnaire
Questionnaires.	5	Student Cou	irse Evarua	icion Que	SSCIUMINATIE

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
1 543		General			0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4 00	1007/1640	4 00	4 10	4 00	1 10	4 00
		ew insights,ski: ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4			1027/1649 1313/1648		4.19 4.07	4.28	4.46	4.20
		uestions reflect	_		0	0	0	0	1	4			1313/1648		4.07	4.23		3.80
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	3		4.25	818/1595		4.15	4.27		4.25
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.60			3.88	4.04	4.28	4.60
	_	_		what you learned	0	1	0	0	_	1			687/1512		3.91	4.10	4.35	4.2
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	1			635/1623			4.16		4.40
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646				4.81	
				ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	-		1151/1621				4.20	
	_u	jiado ono overa.		iiig ciicociveness	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	_	3.00	1101/1011	3.00	3.00	1.00	1120	3.0
		Lecture	_								_		4.4560		4 = 0	4 40	4 = 0	- 0
		uctor's lecture	_		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1568			4.43		
		ctor seem inter		9	0	0	0	0	0	1			840/1572		4.65	4.70	4.83	4.8
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3				1360/1564		4.20	4.28	4.41	
		es contribute to	_	•	0	0 2	1	0	2	0 1			1408/1559			4.29	4.41	
5. Dia aua	IOVISUAI	r techniques em	nance yo	our understanding	U	2	U	U	2	Τ	U	3.33	1130/1352	3.33	4.04	3.98	4.10	3.33
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.22	4.08	4.30	****
2. Were al	l studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	4		0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.52	***
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	***	4.41	4.30	4.56	***
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	iteria f	for grading made	=		4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.87	***
5 Did con	ferences	Field Williams Field Williams		ield activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 312	****	3 80	3 68	3 83	***
J. Dia con	I CI CIICCE	s neip you carr	y out 11	icia accivicies	-	U	Ü	O	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	/ 512		3.00	3.00	3.03	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	5
 00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 1	A 0					or Ma			·	 Graduat		2	Majo		 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		re(	4urr,	EU I	JI Ma	מיטנ.		U	Graduat	C	4	Ma JC	) <u>T</u>	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		061	icia.	•				•	onder g	Luu	5	14011		1
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E] e	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
craa.	4	3.30 1.00	_	P 0								J	respons					,
						0.1						-	_ COL OHD		91			
				I 0		Oth	ner					1						

Course-Section: PHYS 606 0101 University of Mary Title CLASSICAL MECHANICS Baltimore Count Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

11

University of Maryland Page 1329
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire	

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fro	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_		_		_			_	_							
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	590/1649		4.19	4.28	4.46	4.55
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	756/1648		4.07	4.23	4.34	4.36
		estions reflec			0	0	1	0	2	7	1		1159/137!		4.15	4.27	4.44	3.64
		uations reflect			0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	580/159		4.05	4.20	4.35	4.44
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	815/1533		3.88	4.04	4.28	4.00
				o what you learned	0	1	0	-	2 1	3	5	4.30			3.91	4.10	4.35	4.30
		g system clearly		ined	0	1	0	0	_	3	6		502/1623		4.32	4.16	4.29	4.50
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646		4.92	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	374/162	4.50	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	3 4.82	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.82
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.83	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	511/156	4.64	4.20	4.28	4.41	4.64
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	763/1559		4.21	4.29	4.41	4.45
				our understanding	0	4	2	2	0	0	3		1219/1352		4.04	3.98	4.10	3.00
		Discus																
ו הגם ו					2	0	0	1	2	2	2	2 00	006/130	1 2 00	4 22	4 00	4 20	2 00
				what you learned	2	0	0	1 0	2 2	3	⊿	3.89 4.22			4.22	4.08	4.30	3.89 4.22
				d to participate d open discussion		0	0	1	4	0			,		4.44	4.29	4.52	
		_		a open aiscussion	2	5	1	0	1	0			1085/1368		4.41	4.30	4.56	3.78
4. were sp	peciai te	echniques succe	SSIUI		2	5	Т	U	1	U	2	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.18	3.95	4.03	3.50
		Labora	-															
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 55!	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.66	5.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t			announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.67	4.54	4.63	***
		ons contribute			10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.35	4.42	***
				Frequ	onat	. Dia	trib	t i o	2									
				riequ	.ency	DIS	CLID	uc10	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				T	/pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 4		Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 :е	6	Majo	 or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						,	-	-			-	) -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-	rad	5	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	u	_				-	011401	,_ ~~	-	2,011		J
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E.I.	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoue	rh
	ŭ	2.20 1.00	-	P 0								-		ses to h			_	,
				I O		O+1	her					9	_ CDPOII					
				<u> </u>		~ C												

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHYS 609 0101

3

MODERN OPTICS

SHIH, YANHUA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

Page 1330 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies	5			ructor		_		UMBC Level	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u cain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.46	4.67
					0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.07	4.23	4.34	5.00
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>							0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.15	4.27	4.44	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0 0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.05	4.20	4.35	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512		3.91	4.10	4.35	5.00
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.33
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646		4.92	4.69	4.81	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621		3.86	4.06	4.20	4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well :	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572		4.65	4.70	4.83	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1564		4.20	4.28	4.41	5.00
		es contribute t		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.21	4.29	4.41	5.00
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1351/1352	1.00	4.04	3.98	4.10	1.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.22	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.52	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.18	3.95	4.03	4.50
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.66	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 7 1					or Ma			·	 Graduat		2	Majo		3
00-27 28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 1 B 2		ке	quir	eu I	or Ma	ı Jor:	5	0	Graduat	e	4	мајс	Σ	3
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cor	nera	1				1	IIndon ~	rad	1	Non	maiom	0
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Gei	nera.	L				Т	Under-g	ıau	Т	non-	-major	U
						. רים	0a+ i :	700				0	####	Moana +	horo a	vo not	ono	rh
Grau.	F 0 P 0										#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							
						O+1	hom					1	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı	10	
				5 0 I 0		Oti	her					1						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 621 0101 University ATMOS PHYSICS I Barrier: SPARLING, LYNN
Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Page 1331
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

Questions					NR	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vo	u cain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.46	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	797/1648		4.07	4.23	4.34	4.33
	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	401/1375		4.15	4.27	4.44	4.67				
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	3	3	4.50	497/1595		4.05	4.20	4.35	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	545/1533		3.88	4.04	4.28	4.33
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512		3.91	4.10	4.35	4.67
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	502/1623		4.32	4.16	4.29	4.50
		was class canc		11100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646		4.92	4.69		4.83
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1		789/1621			4.06		4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.65	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.20	4.28	4.41	4.33
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.21	4.29	4.41	4.33
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.04	3.98	4.10	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.22	4.08	4.30	4.00
2. Were a	.11 studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.44	4.29	4.52	4.50
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.56	5.00
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.66	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 3		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma		- – – -	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1								-				) •		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	6
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0											-			-		5 2	-
Grad.						Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	rh
	P 0												respons				_	•
	I O					Otl	her					4			5			
				? 0		Octiet												

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PHYS 690 0101

12

PROF SKILLS PHYS

HAYDEN, MICHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Page 1332 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

******				~										
			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1027/1649	4.20	4.19	4.28	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.07	4.23	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.15	4.27	4.44	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.05	4.20	4.35	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	432/1533	4.44	3.88	4.04	4.28	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	345/1512	4.56	3.91	4.10	4.35	4.56
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	199/1623	4.78	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	789/1621	4.17	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.22	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.44	4.29	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	404/ 948	4.11	4.18	3.95	4.03	4.11
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.19	4.29	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	45/ 88	4.67	4.67	4.54	4.63	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	38/ 85	4.67	4.67	4.47	4.50	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	39/ 81	4.56	4.56	4.43	4.43	4.56
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	32/ 92	4.67	4.67	4.35	4.42	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	54/ 288	4.38	4.13	3.68	3.87	4.38
J J														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0			_			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	8			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 707 0101 University of Maryland Page 1333 Title ADV ELECTROMAGNETIC TH Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

							ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Question	S	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		1														
1. Did you g	ain new insights,ski	lls from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the i	nstructor make clear	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.07	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the e	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.15	4.27	4.44	5.00		
4. Did other	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.05	4.20	4.35	5.00		
5. Did assig	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.88	4.04	4.28	5.00		
6. Did writt	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.91	4.10	4.35	5.00		
7. Was the g	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.29	5.00		
8. How many	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.81	5.00
	Lectur	e														
1. Were the	instructor's lecture	s well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.52	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the i	nstructor seem inter	ested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.65	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lectu	re material presente	d and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.20	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the l	ectures contribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.21	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audio	visual techniques en	hance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.04	3.98	4.10	5.00
	Discus	sion														
1. Did class	discussions contrib	ute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.22	4.08	4.30	5.00
		couraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.52	5.00
	_	fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.41	4.30	4.56	5.00
	ial techniques succe	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.18	3.95	4.03	5.00
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earn	ed Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ty	oe			Majors	\$
	<u>.</u>															
	0.00-0.99 0.00-1.99	0 A 0 0 B 1		Required for Majors 0							Graduate 0			Major		1

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