```
Course-Section: PHYS 100  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1298
Title      IDEAS IN PHYSICS                   Baltimore County                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   SINSKY, JOEL                     Fall   2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   129
Questionnaires:  65                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   0   0   1  20  42  4.65   446/1649   4.65  4.19  4.28  4.11  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   0   2  14  47  4.71   300/1648   4.71  4.07  4.23  4.16  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect 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 other evaluations 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 assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading 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 many times was class cancelled                  3   3   0   0   0   8  51  4.86   731/1646   4.86  4.92  4.69  4.67  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall 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 the instructor'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
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   0   0  60  5.00     1/1572   5.00  4.65  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented 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 the lectures 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
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 2  0   0   3  12  41  4.68   201/1352   4.68  4.04  3.98  3.86  4.68

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 0  0   0   1   3  27  4.84   312/1382   4.84  4.44  4.29  4.03  4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 33 0  0   0   3   4  25  4.69   503/1368   4.69  4.41  4.30  4.01  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                  34  17  1   1   1   1  10  4.29  ****/ 948   ****  4.18  3.95  3.75  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 63 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 243   ****  4.03  4.12  4.08  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  52   ****  ****  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48   ****  ****  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39   ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39   ****  ****  4.38  4.37  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  53   ****  ****  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  30   ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  41   ****  ****  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  24   ****  ****  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      64  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 110   ****  ****  3.99  3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades          Reasons               Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     4      0.00-0.99   1      A   32       Required for Majors  39    Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55     5      1.00-1.99   0      B   16
56-83    10      2.00-2.99   9      C    1       General               4    Under-grad  65      Non-major  65
84-150    9      3.00-3.49   9      D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   7      F    0       Electives             4    #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                    I    0       Other                 3
                                    ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 106  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1299
Title       INTRO ASTROBIOLOGY              Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  HENRIKSEN, MARK                 Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires: 18                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  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   8  4.64  550/1368  4.64  4.41  4.30  4.01  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   8  0  1  0  1   0  3.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  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  4.00 ****/  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  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.42  4.24  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 106  0101              University of Maryland                    Page 1299
Title        INTRO ASTROBIOLOGY               Baltimore County                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  HENRIKSEN, MARK                    Fall   2008                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 18                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    3        0.00-0.99    0         A    5       Required for Majors  6      Graduate      0      Major         3
 28-55    1        1.00-1.99    0         B    5
 56-83    1        2.00-2.99    2         C    4       General              6      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
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                1
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  0103            University of Maryland                          Page 1300
Title        BASIC PHYSICS I              Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  LAI, MEIMEI    (Instr. A)    Fall  2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:  8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Freq	uenc	ies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	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	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	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
8. How many times was class cancelled	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

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
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	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	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

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
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	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.18	3.95	3.75	****

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
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

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
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		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	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	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  0103            University of Maryland                              Page 1301
Title       BASIC PHYSICS I               Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:              (Instr. B)       Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:  8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	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	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	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
8. How many times was class cancelled	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	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1504/1621	3.57	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1568	4.39	4.52	4.43	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	4.51	4.65	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	3.89	4.20	4.28	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	4.09	4.21	4.29	4.20	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/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	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
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		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	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	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  0108            University of Maryland                          Page 1302
Title       BASIC PHYSICS I               Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   LAI, MEIMEI    (Instr. A)        Fall  2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 20                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    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 4 0 2 4 3 3 4  3.19 1468/1621  3.57  3.86  4.06  3.96  3.51

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8  0  1  0  0  2  9  4.50  852/1568  4.39  4.52  4.43  4.39  4.25
2. Did the instructor 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 lecture material 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 the lectures contribute to what 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 audiovisual 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 class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08  3.86  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29  4.03  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 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   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 1 3 1 10  4.13  149/ 243  3.85  4.03  4.12  4.08  4.13
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  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
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.83  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1      0.00-0.99   0       A   9       Required for Majors  1     Graduate     0      Major      0
  28-55    4      1.00-1.99   0       B   5
  56-83    6      2.00-2.99   2       C   2       General              0     Under-grad  20      Non-major 20
  84-150   2      3.00-3.49   3       D   0
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00   6       F   0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I   0       Other               14
                                      ?   0
```

```
Title        BASIC PHYSICS I                      Baltimore County                                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)           Fall   2008                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires:  20                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	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
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	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	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	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.44	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	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	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	1	3	1	10	4.13	149/ 243	3.85	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.13
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	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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  0109                University of Maryland                              Page 1304
Title       BASIC PHYSICS I                    Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  ANDERSON, ERIC                     Fall  2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 18                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76  317/1649  3.99  4.19  4.28  4.11  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47  599/1648  3.92  4.07  4.23  4.16  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47  581/1375  4.27  4.15  4.27  4.10  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  8  0  1  1  3  4  4.11  996/1595  3.91  4.05  4.20  4.03  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1  1  1  1  3 10  4.25  624/1533  3.71  3.88  4.04  3.87  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5 2  0  1  3  6  3.92 1008/1512  3.93  3.91  4.10  3.86  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  4 12  4.65  345/1623  4.03  4.32  4.16  4.08  4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 17  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  2  8  6  4.12  847/1621  3.57  3.86  4.06  3.96  4.12


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  147/1568  4.39  4.52  4.43  4.39  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  765/1572  4.51  4.65  4.70  4.64  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0  0  2  6 10  4.44  728/1564  3.89  4.20  4.28  4.20  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  2  0  1  3 12  4.28  952/1559  4.09  4.21  4.29  4.20  4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  2  4 11  4.53  291/1352  4.09  4.04  3.98  3.86  4.53


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08  3.86  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29  4.03  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/1368  ****  4.41  4.30  4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  3.95  3.75  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   7  0  1  0  1  3  6  4.18  119/ 221  3.26  3.71  4.16  4.05  4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 1 0  2  4  4  3.91  173/ 243  3.85  4.03  4.12  4.08  3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 1 0 0  0  1  9  4.90   28/ 212  3.86  4.08  4.40  4.43  4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/ 209  3.99  4.13  4.35  4.38  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly 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 criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  4.00  4.13  3.68  3.54  ****


                 Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  15  0  0  2  0  1  0  2.67 ****/ 312  3.50  3.80  3.68  3.51  ****


                 Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.83  ****

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0      A   6        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major        0
  28-55     6        1.00-1.99   0      B   4
  56-83     2        2.00-2.99   2      C   4        General               1      Under-grad   18      Non-major   18
  84-150    2        3.00-3.49   1      D   0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   9      F   0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                13
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  0110              University of Maryland                           Page 1305
Title        BASIC PHYSICS I                 Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  WATTS, SHELLY C                 Fall  2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  17                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  1  3  7  6  4.06 1149/1649  3.99  4.19  4.28  4.11  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  2  6  7  2  3.53 1474/1648  3.92  4.07  4.23  4.16  3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3 12  2  3.94 1000/1375  4.27  4.15  4.27  4.10  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  8  0  1  2  5  1  3.67 1335/1595  3.91  4.05  4.20  4.03  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  2  2  7  3  3.44 1296/1533  3.71  3.88  4.04  3.87  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  6  1  0  2  7  0  3.50 1266/1512  3.93  3.91  4.10  3.86  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  4  2  7  3  3.56 1363/1623  4.03  4.32  4.16  4.08  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  465/1646  4.99  4.92  4.69  4.67  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  2  5  6  4.31  632/1621  3.57  3.86  4.06  3.96  4.31

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  3  6  8  4.29 1088/1568  4.39  4.52  4.43  4.39  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  2  6  9  4.41 1313/1572  4.51  4.65  4.70  4.64  4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  1  2  6  5  4.07  650/1352  4.09  4.04  3.98  3.86  4.07

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08  3.86  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29  4.03  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00 ****/1368  ****  4.41  4.30  4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  2  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  3.95  3.75  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    4  0  2  1  2  6  2  3.38  200/ 221  3.26  3.71  4.16  4.05  3.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4  0  0  0  5  4  4  3.92  169/ 243  3.85  4.03  4.12  4.08  3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4  0  0  1  4  3  5  3.92  172/ 212  3.86  4.08  4.40  4.43  3.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             4  0  0  1  0  4  8  4.46  111/ 209  3.99  4.13  4.35  4.38  4.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   4  2  0  1  1  5  4  4.09  380/ 555  3.78  4.19  4.29  4.14  4.09

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  4.00  4.13  3.68  3.54  ****

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  14  1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 312  3.50  3.80  3.68  3.51  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type             Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0     0.00-0.99   0      A    2     Required for Majors  2     Graduate      0     Major         0
 28-55      5     1.00-1.99   0      B    7
 56-83      2     2.00-2.99   1      C    3     General              0     Under-grad   17     Non-major    17
 84-150     1     3.00-3.49   2      D    0
 Grad.      0     3.50-4.00   5      F    0     Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                               responses to be significant
                                     I    0     Other               12
                                     ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  0111              University of Maryland                                    Page 1306
Title       BASIC PHYSICS I                  Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DOTSON, AMANDA                      Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires:  2                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1498/1649  3.99  4.19  4.28  4.11  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  546/1375  4.27  4.15  4.27  4.10  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 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 written assignments contribute 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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1387/1623  4.03  4.32  4.16  4.08  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0  1  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  0  0  1  0  4.00  914/1621  3.57  3.86  4.06  3.96  4.00


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1568  4.39  4.52  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1572  4.51  4.65  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1496/1564  3.89  4.20  4.28  4.20  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1559  4.09  4.21  4.29  4.20  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1352  4.09  4.04  3.98  3.86  5.00


                   Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  0   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  129/ 221  3.26  3.71  4.16  4.05  4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50   65/ 243  3.85  4.03  4.12  4.08  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50  105/ 212  3.86  4.08  4.40  4.43  4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 209  3.99  4.13  4.35  4.38  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  0112              University of Maryland                              Page 1307
Title       BASIC PHYSICS I                  Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DIAO, LIJUN                         Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires: 16               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   4  4  3  3  2  2.69 1635/1649  3.99  4.19  4.28  4.11  2.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     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 questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   6   1  4  1  3  1  2.90 1554/1595  3.91  4.05  4.20  4.03  2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   2  3  4  3  3  3.13 1411/1533  3.71  3.88  4.04  3.87  3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  7  2  1  2  1  2  3.00 1428/1512  3.93  3.91  4.10  3.86  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   2  4  2  1  7  3.44 1419/1623  4.03  4.32  4.16  4.08  3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1646  4.99  4.92  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  6  3  2  1  1  2.08 1609/1621  3.57  3.86  4.06  3.96  2.08

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   3  1  1  3  4  3.33 1488/1568  4.39  4.52  4.43  4.39  3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   1  2  1  3  5  3.75 1517/1572  4.51  4.65  4.70  4.64  3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   3  1  2  3  3  3.17 1478/1564  3.89  4.20  4.28  4.20  3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0   3  1  2  3  3  3.17 1456/1559  4.09  4.21  4.29  4.20  3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  3  2  1  3  0  3  3.11 1204/1352  4.09  4.04  3.98  3.86  3.11

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   3   0   6  3  3  1  0  1.92  220/ 221  3.26  3.71  4.16  4.05  1.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3  0  4  1  3  5  0  2.69  231/ 243  3.85  4.03  4.12  4.08  2.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3  0  1  4  4  3  1  2.92  212/ 212  3.86  4.08  4.40  4.43  2.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            3   0   5  5  2  1  0  1.92  209/ 209  3.99  4.13  4.35  4.38  1.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3   1   2  4  3  1  2  2.75  506/ 555  3.78  4.19  4.29  4.14  2.75

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   1   0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 288  4.00  4.13  3.68  3.54  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  12   0   0  1  0  3  0  3.50  217/ 312  3.50  3.80  3.68  3.51  3.50

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 112  0101                 University of Maryland                                Page 1308
Title      BASIC PHYSICS II                     Baltimore County                                     FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   ANDERSON, ERIC  (Instr. A)        Fall   2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:  8                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  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  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  2.50 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
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  4.78  4.92  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  1  2  5  0  3.50 1345/1621  3.55  3.86  4.06  3.96  3.56

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  3  5  4.63  699/1568  4.22  4.52  4.43  4.39  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  4  4  4.50 1241/1572  4.36  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  3.92  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  966/1559  4.00  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  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  3.97  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  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  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  3.68  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                   University of Maryland                        Page 1308
Title          BASIC PHYSICS II                    Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    ANDERSON, ERIC  (Instr. A)          Fall   2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires: 8                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0          A    1       Required for Majors   0       Graduate     0         Major        0
28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0          B    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 significant
                                          I    0       Other                 6
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 112  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1309
Title        BASIC PHYSICS II                Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DOTSON, AMANDA  (Instr. B)      Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  8                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions               NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   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  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  2.50 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
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  4.78  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  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  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  3.97  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  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  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  3.68  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            University of Maryland                        Page 1309
Title           BASIC PHYSICS II          Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:     DOTSON, AMANDA  (Instr. B)      Fall   2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0       A    1         Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major       0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    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 significant
                                         I    0         Other                6
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 112  0102              University of Maryland                    Page 1310
Title      BASIC PHYSICS II                 Baltimore County                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   YOU, HAO      (Instr. A)      Fall  2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires:  9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                      Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  1  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  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 3 0  1  1  1  1  2  3.33 1429/1621  3.55  3.86  4.06  3.96  3.54

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  1  0  1  0  5  4.14 1205/1568  4.22  4.52  4.43  4.39  3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  1  0  1  0  5  4.14 1435/1572  4.36  4.65  4.70  4.64  4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  1  0  2  3  3.71 1316/1564  3.92  4.20  4.28  4.20  3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  1  1  0  4  3.71 1301/1559  4.00  4.21  4.29  4.20  3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  1  1  0  0  5  4.00  690/1352  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  0  1.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08  3.86  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29  4.03  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  1  0  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
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  144/ 212  3.95  4.08  4.40  4.43  4.14
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
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.13  3.68  3.54  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 312  4.00  3.80  3.68  3.51  ****
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 112  0102                    University of Maryland                              Page 1311
Title        BASIC PHYSICS II                      Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)            Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  9                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  1  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  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  0 1.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08 3.86  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29 4.03  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 1 0 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
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14  144/ 212  3.95  4.08  4.40 4.43  4.14
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
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8   0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.13  3.68 3.54  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7   0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 312  4.00  3.80  3.68 3.51  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 121  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1312
Title       INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I        Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    CORBITT, PAUL T            Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      50
Questionnaires:   5                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    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  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A   2      Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0     Major      0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0       B   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 significant
                                       I   0      Other                3
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 121  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1313
Title       INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I             Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   CUI, LILI                        Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   310
Questionnaires: 121                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  4   0  2  7 27 37 44 3.97 1209/1649  3.65  4.19  4.28 4.11  3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   4   0  2 14 19 37 45 3.93 1197/1648  3.47  4.07  4.23 4.16  3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4   0  4  8 15 44 46 4.03  943/1375  4.26  4.15  4.27 4.10  4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   5  41  5  6 18 24 22 3.69 1317/1595  3.35  4.05  4.20 4.03  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 21  6  8 17 30 33 3.81 1017/1533  2.40  3.88  4.04 3.87  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 55  3  8 13 24 12 3.57 1227/1512  2.78  3.91  4.10 3.86  3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           6   1  4  5 22 35 48 4.04 1014/1623  3.52  4.32  4.16 4.08  4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                 5   0  0  0  0  0 116 5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.92  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor'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
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4   0  1  2  5 38 71 4.50 1241/1572  4.50  4.65  4.70 4.64  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0  7  9 28 44 29 3.68 1332/1564  3.68  4.20  4.28 4.20  3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4   0  8  6 21 44 38 3.84 1231/1559  3.84  4.21  4.29 4.20  3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 7  8  6 25 28 43 3.84  860/1352  3.84  4.04  3.98 3.86  3.84


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 107 0  3  2  3  4  2 3.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08 3.86  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 106 0  2  2  0  3  8 3.87 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29 4.03  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 106 0  2  1  3  3  6 3.67 ****/1368  ****  4.41  4.30 4.01  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 105  5  2  1  4  0  4 3.27 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  3.95 3.75  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 117  2  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/ 221  ****  3.71  4.16 4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 120 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.03  4.12 4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 120 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 212  ****  4.08  4.40 4.43  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 115 0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.19  4.29 4.14  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 118 2  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  88  ****  4.67  4.54 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 120 0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  85  ****  4.67  4.47 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 120 0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  81  ****  4.56  4.43 4.39  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 120 0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.72  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades      Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    14      0.00-0.99    1      A   35       Required for Majors  4    Graduate      0     Major       5
  28-55    23      1.00-1.99    0      B   34
  56-83    13      2.00-2.99   11      C   26       General              0    Under-grad  121     Non-major 116
  84-150    3      3.00-3.49   11      D    6
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   27      F    0       Electives            3    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               95
                                       ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 121H 0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1314
Title      INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS          Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   STAFF         (Instr. A)          Fall  2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    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  0  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  4.36  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  3.85  4.18  3.95  3.75  3.85

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.19  4.29  4.14  ****
```

                                 Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4       0.00-0.99   3      A    5      Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0      Major       4
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B    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 enough
                                      P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               11
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 121H 0101          University of Maryland              Page 1315
Title     INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS          Baltimore County                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  GEORGE, IAN    (Instr. B)         Fall  2008                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  15              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  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 3  0  0  0  1  5  6  4.42  497/1621  3.55  3.86  4.06  3.96  3.55

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and 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 the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7  5  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1352  3.10  4.04  3.98  3.86  3.10

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 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  3.85  4.18  3.95  3.75  3.85

             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.19  4.29  4.14  ****
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4      0.00-0.99   3        A     5       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major       4
28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B     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 enough
                                       P     0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I     0       Other               11
                                       ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 122  0102                University of Maryland                              Page 1316
Title       INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I              Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   CUI, LILI                           Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   214
Questionnaires: 105                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                       NR NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   1   7  30  33  33  3.87 1303/1649  3.87  4.19  4.28  4.11  3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   4  10  36  28  26  3.60 1451/1648  3.60  4.07  4.23  4.16  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0   6   9  34  27  26  3.57 1184/1375  3.57  4.15  4.27  4.10  3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3  41   3   4  19  16  19  3.72 1300/1595  3.72  4.05  4.20  4.03  3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 21   5   8  25  20  23  3.59 1186/1533  3.59  3.88  4.04  3.87  3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 35  5  11  12  18  21  3.58 1214/1512  3.58  3.91  4.10  3.86  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   5  17  28  53  4.25  815/1623  4.25  4.32  4.16  4.08  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0   0   0   0   0 102  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.92  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 10  15  35  22   9  3.05 1496/1621  3.05  3.86  4.06  3.96  3.05

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   5   9  32  55  4.36 1031/1568  4.36  4.52  4.43  4.39  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   4  12  28  56  4.36 1346/1572  4.36  4.65  4.70  4.64  4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   8  18  30  20  23  3.32 1443/1564  3.32  4.20  4.28  4.20  3.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   1   8  10  26  27  28  3.58 1351/1559  3.58  4.21  4.29  4.20  3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 5  3   7  12  28  40  4.06  661/1352  4.06  4.04  3.98  3.86  4.06

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 63 0  6  10   9   6  11  3.14 1232/1384  3.14  4.22  4.08  3.86  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 63 0  2   7   7  12  14  3.69 1132/1382  3.69  4.44  4.29  4.03  3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 63 0 3   4   7  14  14  3.76 1090/1368  3.76  4.41  4.30  4.01  3.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  62   8  5   3   3   7  17  3.80  578/ 948  3.80  4.18  3.95  3.75  3.80

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  103  0  0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/ 221  ****  3.71  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 103 0 0  1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.03  4.12  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 103 0 0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 212  ****  4.08  4.40  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           103  0  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 209  ****  4.13  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  83  0  0   2   6   1  13  4.14 ****/ 555  ****  4.19  4.29  4.14  ****

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 93  0  0   1   0  10   1  3.92 ****/ 288  ****  4.13  3.68  3.54  ****

                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  85  0  0   0   0  18   2  4.10 ****/ 312  ****  3.80  3.68  3.51  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 104 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    104  0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      104  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  4.27  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	23	1.00-1.99	0	B	49						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	16	C	18	General	3	Under-grad	105	Non-major	100
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	17	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	79				
				?	5						

```
Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1317
Title      INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L          Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   GOUGOUSI, THEOD              Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       9
Questionnaires:   6               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  433/1649  4.38  4.19  4.28  4.11  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  556/1648  4.58  4.07  4.23  4.16  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  546/1375  4.50  4.15  4.27  4.10  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  236/1595  4.71  4.05  4.20  4.03  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  815/1533  3.81  3.88  4.04  3.87  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  380/1512  4.38  3.91  4.10  3.86  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  720/1623  4.54  4.32  4.16  4.08  4.33
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 grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00  914/1621  4.00  3.86  4.06  3.96  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  480/1568  4.88  4.52  4.43  4.39  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  931/1572  4.88  4.65  4.70  4.64  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  651/1564  4.38  4.20  4.28  4.20  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  695/1559  4.46  4.21  4.29  4.20  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  0  1  2  0  3.67  970/1352  4.03  4.04  3.98  3.86  3.67


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 221  4.33  3.71  4.16  4.05  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   58/ 243  4.41  4.03  4.12  4.08  4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 212  4.94  4.08  4.40  4.43  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 209  5.00  4.13  4.35  4.38  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly 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 conferences help you carry out field activities 5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.80  3.68  3.51  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0103                University of Maryland                                    Page 1318
Title      INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L               Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    GOUGOUSI, THEOD                    Fall   2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  12                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   3   5   4  4.08 1129/1649  4.38  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   1   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  3.63 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  4.38  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  5.00  4.92  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0   0   0   1   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   0   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  4.38  4.20  4.28 4.20  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  804/1559  4.46  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  4.03  4.04  3.98 3.86  4.40


                  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

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected 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          B    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 significant
                                          I    0        Other                7
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 224  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1319
Title        INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I       Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MARTINS, JOSE                Fall   2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires:  23                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  2  7  14  4.52  617/1649  4.52  4.19  4.28  4.29  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  1  4  13  4  3.78 1326/1648  3.78  4.07  4.23  4.25  3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  3  2  13  5  3.87 1055/1375  3.87  4.15  4.27  4.37  3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  7  0  1  4  10  1  3.69 1323/1595  3.69  4.05  4.20  4.22  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  0  4  9  9  4.09  761/1533  4.09  3.88  4.04  4.04  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  7  1  0  6  4  5  3.75 1119/1512  3.75  3.91  4.10  4.14  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  7  6  9  4.00 1029/1623  4.00  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  23  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.92  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor'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
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  1  3  17  4.76  912/1572  4.76  4.65  4.70  4.73  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  1  1  3  7  9  4.05 1109/1564  4.05  4.20  4.28  4.27  4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  2  4  6  9  4.05 1102/1559  4.05  4.21  4.29  4.33  4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  1  0  2  4  7  7  3.95  754/1352  3.95  4.04  3.98  4.07  3.95


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  21  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08  3.99  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  21  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29  4.19  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  21  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1368  ****  4.41  4.30  4.21  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 21  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  3.95  3.89  ****


           Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly 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 criteria for grading made clear               18  1  0  1  1  2  0  3.25 ****/ 288  ****  4.13  3.68  3.65  ****


           Field Work
5. Did conferences 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 there enough proctors for all the students    21  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.72  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0      A   9      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major        13
  28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0      B  10                                                    
  56-83      8       2.00-2.99   2      C   0      General              3    Under-grad   23      Non-major    10
  84-150     2       3.00-3.49   3      D   0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00  10      F   0      Electives            2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                               responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other               18
                                        ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 303  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1320
Title      THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH            Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MCCANN, KEVIN                      Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      0  0  0  0  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  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1512  ****  3.91  4.10  4.11  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained               0  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  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  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
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  601/1368  4.57  4.41  4.30  4.39  4.57
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  0  2  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.19  4.29  4.22  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A   4      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major       10
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B   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
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                11
                                        ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0101                University of Maryland                                  Page 1321
Title       OPTICS LABORATORY                 Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B                   Fall  2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires: 10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  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


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades       Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A   10      Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major       9
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B    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
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 9
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0102                University of Maryland                              Page 1322
Title       OPTICS LABORATORY                    Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B                       Fall  2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  6                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  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  1  5  4.83  195/1648  4.92  4.07  4.23  4.18  4.83
4. Did other evaluations 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
5. Did assigned readings 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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  263/1512  4.63  3.91  4.10  4.11  4.67
7. Was the grading system 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 grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1621  4.94  3.86  4.06  4.02  5.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1568  4.89  4.52  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  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  0  5  5.00    1/1564  4.89  4.20  4.28  4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  284/1559  4.75  4.21  4.29  4.23  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1352  4.75  4.04  3.98  3.97  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions 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
2. Were all students 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
3. Did the instructor 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 techniques 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 increase 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
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0  0  0  0  0  0  6  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  1  5  4.83   43/ 212  4.92  4.08  4.40  4.21  4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           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  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  338/ 555  4.62  4.19  4.29  4.22  4.33

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    3        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major         6
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    3
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0        C    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 significant
                                        I    0        Other                6
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101                University of Maryland                        Page 1323
Title       MODERN PHYSICS LAB                 Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  WU, EN-SHINN                       Fall  2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  1  3  2  1  3.13 1589/1649  3.13  4.19  4.28  4.27  3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  1  4  0  1  2.63 1628/1648  2.63  4.07  4.23  4.18  2.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  950/1375  4.00  4.15  4.27  4.22  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  1  4  1  1  3.00 1537/1595  3.00  4.05  4.20  4.21  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  2  0  3  1  1  2.86 1483/1533  2.86  3.88  4.04  4.05  2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  0  2  3  1  3.43 1309/1512  3.43  3.91  4.10  4.11  3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  0  4  1  2  3.71 1293/1623  3.71  4.32  4.16  4.08  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  913/1646  4.75  4.92  4.69  4.67  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  2  1  2  1  1  2.71 1566/1621  2.71  3.86  4.06  4.02  2.71


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  2  0  2  1  2  3.14 1506/1568  3.14  4.52  4.43  4.39  3.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  1  0  2  0  4  3.86 1502/1572  3.86  4.65  4.70  4.64  3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  1  2  1  2  3.29 1452/1564  3.29  4.20  4.28  4.25  3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  4  0  2  1  0  2.00 1550/1559  2.00  4.21  4.29  4.23  2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  5  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1352  ****  4.04  3.98  3.97  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                   5   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  3.95  4.00  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding 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 provided with adequate background 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 available 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 the lab instructor provide assistance            0   0  2  2  3  0  1  2.50  208/ 209  2.50  4.13  4.35  4.12  2.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   0  1  1  4  1  1  3.00  490/ 555  3.00  4.19  4.29  4.22  3.00


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0        A    1          Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major        6
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B    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
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                7
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 407  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1324
Title     ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY             Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   SPARLING, LYNN                 Fall  2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  238/1649  4.85  4.19  4.28  4.50  4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  521/1648  4.54  4.07  4.23  4.36  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  521/1375  4.54  4.15  4.27  4.48  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  0  1  1  2  6  4.30  759/1595  4.30  4.05  4.20  4.36  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  1  0  1  3  7  4.25  624/1533  4.25  3.88  4.04  4.14  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute 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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  210/1623  4.77  4.32  4.16  4.27  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  597/1646  4.92  4.92  4.69  4.71  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  261/1621  4.64  3.86  4.06  4.24  4.64


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  1 11  4.77  461/1568  4.77  4.52  4.43  4.54  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  473/1572  4.92  4.65  4.70  4.79  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  702/1564  4.46  4.20  4.28  4.40  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1  0  1  1  2  8  4.42  818/1559  4.42  4.21  4.29  4.41  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 9  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1352  ****  4.04  3.98  4.07  ****


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                  10   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  3.95  4.31  ****

           Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.19  4.29  4.41  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons              Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0        A    3        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0       Major       10
28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B    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
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                11
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 480  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1325
Title       TECH IN THEORETICAL PH          Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  GEORGANOPOULOS,                  Fall  2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  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  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  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  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  0  5  5 4.50  380/1512  4.50  3.91  4.10 4.26 4.50
 7. 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
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  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  0  0  0  1  2 11 4.71 1003/1572  4.71  4.65  4.70 4.79 4.71
 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  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  0  1 5.00 ****/ 221  ****  3.71  4.16 4.73 ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0  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  0  1 5.00 ****/ 212 ****  4.08  4.40 4.57 ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  0  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  0  1 5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.19  4.29 4.41 ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99   2       A   5        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     7      Major      6
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B   8
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   0       C   0        General              0    Under-grad   7      Non-major  8
 84-150     1       3.00-3.49   0       D   0
 Grad.      7       3.50-4.00   1       F   0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               13
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 601  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1326
Title      QUANTUM MECHANICS                 Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  FRANSON, JAMES                  Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires: 16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  510/1649  4.60  4.19  4.28  4.46  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  3  6  6  4.20  966/1648  4.20  4.07  4.23  4.34  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  321/1375  4.73  4.15  4.27  4.44  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   5  0  0  0  5  5  4.50  497/1595  4.50  4.05  4.20  4.35  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  241/1533  4.67  3.88  4.04  4.28  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  241/1623  4.73  4.32  4.16  4.29  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  0 15  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  9  3  4.25  687/1621  4.25  3.86  4.06  4.20  4.25


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1568  5.00  4.52  4.43  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  1  5  9  4.53  620/1564  4.53  4.20  4.28  4.41  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  512/1559  4.67  4.21  4.29  4.41  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 0  2  2  3  4  3.82  872/1352  3.82  4.04  3.98  4.10  3.82


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  0  4  3  5  4.08  767/1384  4.08  4.22  4.08  4.30  4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0  0  1  3  2  6  4.08  927/1382  4.08  4.44  4.29  4.52  4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                 4   9  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 948  ****  4.18  3.95  4.03  ****


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.03  4.12  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 209  ****  4.13  4.35  4.80  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.67  4.54  4.63  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99    2        A   8      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      9    Major       5
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B   4                               Under-grad    7    Non-major  11
 56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0        C   0      General              1
 84-150    0      3.00-3.49    1        D   0                               #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.     9      3.50-4.00    1        F   0      Electives            1           responses to be significant
                                        P   0
                                        I   0      Other               12
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 602  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1327
Title      STATISTICAL MECHANICS            Baltimore County                                    FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MCCANN, KEVIN                 Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  4                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
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
Questionnaires: 5                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR NA 1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  4  1  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  2  2  1  3.80 1313/1648  3.80  4.07  4.23 4.34  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  4  0  3.80 1087/1375  3.80  4.15  4.27 4.44  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  818/1595  4.25  4.05  4.20 4.35  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  288/1533  4.60  3.88  4.04 4.28  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  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  0  1  1  3  4.40  635/1623  4.40  4.32  4.16 4.29  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  5  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  2  2  1  3.80 1151/1621  3.80  3.86  4.06 4.20  3.80


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  5  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  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  840/1572  4.80  4.65  4.70 4.83  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  1  1  3.60 1360/1564  3.60  4.20  4.28 4.41  3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  1  0  2  0  2  3.40 1408/1559  3.40  4.21  4.29 4.41  3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  0  0  2  1  0  3.33 1130/1352  3.33  4.04  3.98 4.10  3.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1384  ****  4.22  4.08 4.30  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1382  ****  4.44  4.29 4.52  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1368  ****  4.41  4.30 4.56  ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 4  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  4.13  3.68 3.87  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  4  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.80  3.68 3.83  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 606  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1329
Title      CLASSICAL MECHANICS              Baltimore County                                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  WORCHESKY, TERR                  Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                   Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  0  0  0  5  6 4.55  590/1649  4.55  4.19  4.28 4.46  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  0  7  4 4.36  756/1648  4.36  4.07  4.23 4.34  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  0  2  7  1 3.64 1159/1375  3.64  4.15  4.27 4.44  3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   2  0  0  1  3  5 4.44  580/1595  4.44  4.05  4.20 4.35  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   1  0  1  3  1  5 4.00  815/1533  4.00  3.88  4.04 4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  2  3  5 4.30  627/1512  4.30  3.91  4.10 4.35  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   1  0  0  1  3  6 4.50  502/1623  4.50  4.32  4.16 4.29  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.92  4.69 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  1  0  0  1  2  5 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  2  9 4.82  372/1568  4.82  4.52  4.43 4.52  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  0 11 5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.65  4.70 4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  0  1  2  8 4.64  511/1564  4.64  4.20  4.28 4.41  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  0  1  4  6 4.45  763/1559  4.45  4.21  4.29 4.41  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   4  2  2  0  0  3 3.00 1219/1352  3.00  4.04  3.98 4.10  3.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0  0  1  2  3  3 3.89  896/1384  3.89  4.22  4.08 4.30  3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0  0  0  2  3  4 4.22  851/1382  4.22  4.44  4.29 4.52  4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2   0  0  1  4  0  4 3.78 1085/1368  3.78  4.41  4.30 4.56  3.78
4. Were special techniques successful                    2   5  1  0  1  0  2 3.50  699/ 948  3.50  4.18  3.95 4.03  3.50

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   7   0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.19  4.29 4.66  5.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.67  4.54 4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     10   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.67  4.35 4.42  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 609  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1330
Title      MODERN OPTICS                        Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   SHIH, YANHUA                        Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    3
Questionnaires:  3                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   433/1649  4.67  4.19  4.28  4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1648  5.00  4.07  4.23  4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1375  5.00  4.15  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   321/1595  4.67  4.05  4.20  4.35  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   241/1533  4.67  3.88  4.04  4.28  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1512  5.00  3.91  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   720/1623  4.33  4.32  4.16  4.29  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  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  1  2  4.67   234/1621  4.67  3.86  4.06  4.20  4.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  3  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  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1572  5.00  4.65  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1564  5.00  4.20  4.28  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     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 0 2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  1351/1352  1.00  4.04  3.98  4.10  1.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1382  5.00  4.44  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   203/ 948  4.50  4.18  3.95  4.03  4.50

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 555  5.00  4.19  4.29  4.66  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 621  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1331
Title        ATMOS PHYSICS I                  Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SPARLING, LYNN                   Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  6                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  644/1649  4.50  4.19  4.28 4.46  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  797/1648  4.33  4.07  4.23 4.34  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  401/1375  4.67  4.15  4.27 4.44  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  497/1595  4.50  4.05  4.20 4.35  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  545/1533  4.33  3.88  4.04 4.28  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  263/1512  4.67  3.91  4.10 4.35  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  502/1623  4.50  4.32  4.16 4.29  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  782/1646  4.83  4.92  4.69 4.81  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  5  1  4.17  789/1621  4.17  3.86  4.06 4.20  4.17

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  852/1568  4.50  4.52  4.43 4.52  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67 1071/1572  4.67  4.65  4.70 4.83  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  854/1564  4.33  4.20  4.28 4.41  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  457/1352  4.33  4.04  3.98 4.10  4.33

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.41  4.30 4.56  5.00

                 Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.19  4.29 4.66  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 690  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1332
Title       PROF SKILLS PHYS               Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  HAYDEN, MICHAEL                Fall  2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires: 10                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   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
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           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

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2        0.00-0.99    0      A    0         Required for Majors   0      Graduate      3        Major       6
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B    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 significant
                                         I    0         Other                 9
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 707  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1333
Title       ADV ELECTROMAGNETIC TH          Baltimore County                                    FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  KRAMER, IVAN                    Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     1
Questionnaires:  1                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1649  5.00  4.19  4.28  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1375  5.00  4.15  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1595  5.00  4.05  4.20  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1533  5.00  3.88  4.04  4.28  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1512  5.00  3.91  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1623  5.00  4.32  4.16  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1646  5.00  4.92  4.69  4.81  5.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1352  5.00  4.04  3.98  4.10  5.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1382  5.00  4.44  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage 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
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 948  5.00  4.18  3.95  4.03  5.00

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected 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        B   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
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                 1
                                       ?   0
```