Course-Section: PHYS 105 1

PHYS 105 1 Univer

Ideas In Astronomy

Instructor: George, Ian M

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 22

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1183 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General					_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	3	12	4.18	953/1509	4.18	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14		4.14	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	886/1287	4.09	4.19	4.30	4.24	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7 3	0 1	2	4 6	3 2	6 10	4.05	1119/1459 776/1406	3.87 4.05	4.11	4.22 4.09	4.11 4.02	3.87 4.05
		10	1	1	1	2	7	4.05		4.05		4.09	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0 1	0	1	3	6	4	7		762/1384 1258/1489	3.62	$4.29 \\ 4.22$	4.11	4.20	4.08 3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	8	13	0		1483/1506		4.72	4.17		3.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	7	5		1076/1463		4.03	4.09		3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	904/1438	4.42	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	562/1421	4.89	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	867/1411	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.27	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	615/1405	4.53	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	261/1236	4.53	4.08	4.00	3.87	4.53
Discussion					•			4 0=						
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	3		****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	18 18	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.50	****/1258 ****/ 873		4.45 4.19	4.38	4.18 3.89	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 6/3		4.19	4.03	3.09	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.99	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.24	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	4.41	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	4.46	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.22	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** 00	****	4 67	4 40	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.67	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92 ****/ 90	****	4.50 4.70	4.54 4.50	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92		4.70	4.38	4.21 4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93		4.90	4.06	3.92	****
		J	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	_	3.00	, , ,		1.50	1.00	3.72	
Field Work	0.1	0	•	•	•	•	-	F 00		als als als als	ate ate ate ate	4 20	2 55	at at at at
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21		0			0	1	5.00	****/ 48 ****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47 ****/ 47	****	****	4.51 4.18	4.53	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44		****	4.10	4.26 4.12	***
3. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	21	O	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	/ 11			1.32	7.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: PHYS 105 1

Title Ideas In Astronomy

Instructor: George, Ian M

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1183 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	А	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 1 University of Maryland Title Basic Physics I Instructor: Anderson,Eric C

Enrollment:

454

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1184

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 95 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	2	6	13	28	38	4.08	1058/1509	4.08	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	4	20	23	39	4.09	1020/1509	4.09	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	2	3	13	29	40	4.17	838/1287	4.17	4.19	4.30	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	32	1	5	12	16	21	3.93	1066/1459	3.93	4.11	4.22	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	2	3	10	6	29	36	4.01	805/1406	4.01	4.01	4.09	4.02	4.01
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	48	4	4	8	9	13	3.61	1145/1384	3.61	4.29	4.11	3.98	3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	2	5	11	15	52	4.29	717/1489	4.29	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	1	0	4	80	4.92	524/1506	4.92	4.72	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	0	2	21	30	22	3.96	905/1463	3.96	4.03	4.09	4.02	3.96
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	9	0	0	2	7	14	63	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	6	10	70	4.74	898/1421	4.74	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	2	16	25	39	4.08	1010/1411	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	3	12	21	44	4.09	1005/1405	4.09	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	4	6	9	21	39	4.08	630/1236	4.08	4.08	4.00	3.87	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	3	5	7	10	3.96	,	3.96	4.24	4.14	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	70	0	0	1	8	8	8	3.92		3.92	4.59	4.33	4.15	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	70	0	0	2	3	13	7	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.45	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	71	12	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	3.89	****
T - la la														
Laboratory				_	_								4 0 -	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	11	8	9	16	13	3.21			3.99	4.16	4.06	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	4	8	19	25	4.11	117/ 198	4.11	4.24	4.22	4.14	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	2	6	7	14	28	4.05	159/ 184		4.41	4.48	4.48	4.05
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	1	4	7	11	34	4.28	118/ 177	4.28	4.46	4.36	4.29	4.28
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	20	1	2	4	7	23	4.32	74/ 165	4.32	4.22	4.18	4.15	4.32
Seminar														
	89	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.67	4.49	4.31	****
 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Was the instructor available for individual attention 	90	1	0	1	0	2	1		****/ 92	****	4.50			++++
	91	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.75 3.67	****/ 90	****	4.70	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned			0		0				,	****		4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	91 91	1	0	1	0	1 1	1		****/ 92 ****/ 93	****	4.82	4.38	4.21 3.92	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	91	Т	U	Т	U	1	Т	3.67	***/ 93		4.90	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	93	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	92	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	, -	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.10	4.12	****
J. Did conferences herp you carry out fred accrylities	ジム	Т	U	Т	U	Т	U	3.00	/ 44			4.34	7.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	93	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Here energy proceeds for all the beautiful	23	U	J	_	U	U	_	5.50	, 50			1.41		

Course-Section: PHYS 111 1
Title Basic Physics I
Instructor: Anderson, Eric C

Enrollment: 454
Questionnaires: 95

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1184 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	21	Required for Majors	62	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	25						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	5	Under-grad	95	Non-major	95
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	11	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	2	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	4						

Course-Section: PHYS 112 1 University of Maryland Title Basic Physics II Instructor: Anderson, Eric C

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1185

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	160			
Questionnaires:	46	Student Cour	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne		s from this course	2	0	0	2	3	10	29	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.50
			ne expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	8	30	4.52	519/1509		4.16	4.26	4.25	4.52
			the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	7	32	4.59	435/1287		4.19	4.30	4.24	4.59
		ations reflect th		2	19	2	2	1	7	13	4.08	924/1459		4.11	4.22	4.11	4.08
			to what you learned	3	0	2	1	8	6	26	4.23	611/1406	4.23	4.01	4.09	4.02	4.23
	-	-	ite to what you learned	3	23	1	3	5	3	8	3.70	1083/1384	3.70	4.29	4.11	3.98	3.70
		system clearly e		3	0	2	0	4	6	31	4.49	485/1489	4.49	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.49
8. How ma	any times	was class cancel	Led	4	1	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	175/1506	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.66	4.98
	-		teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	4	10	21	4.49	353/1463	4.49	4.03	4.09	4.02	4.49
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures v	well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	40	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.91
			ted in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	269/1421	4.95	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presented a	and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	7	30	4.57	532/1411	4.57	4.19	4.31	4.27	4.57
4. Did th	ne lecture	s contribute to v	vhat you learned	4	1	0	1	2	9	29	4.61	540/1405	4.61	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.61
			nce your understanding	6	2	0	1	3	10	24	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.08	4.00	3.87	4.50
		on															
1. Did cl	lass discu	to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	3.95	****	
	rid class discussions contribute to what you learne Tere all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
	ere all students actively encouraged to participate id the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1258	****	4.45	4.38	4.18	****
		chniques successi	_	39	2	0	0	1	1	3		****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	3.89	****
		Laborato	cy														
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understand:	ing of the material	17	0	3	8	7	8	3	3.00	179/ 184	3.00	3.99	4.16	4.06	3.00
			background information	17	0	0	1	12	6	10	3.86	155/ 198	3.86	4.24	4.22	4.14	3.86
_	-	_	ole for lab activities	17	0	0	2	7	9	11	4.00	161/ 184	4.00	4.41	4.48	4.48	4.00
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provide a	assistance	18	0	1	2	4	6	15	4.14	132/ 177	4.14	4.46	4.36	4.29	4.14
		_	s clearly specified	17	12	0	3	1	5	8	4.06	101/ 165	4.06	4.22	4.18	4.15	4.06
		Self Pac	ced														
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribute	e to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clear t	the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were y	your conta	cts with the inst	tructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
		Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Τv	pe			Majors	\$	
00-27 28-55	2 3	0.00-0.99 (1.00-1.99 (Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 3	Ι	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	0
	<i>3</i> 8	2.00-2.99			00	0225	1				1	IIndon	rad 1	15	Max	ma i ara	46
56-83 84-150	8 5	3.00-3.49		General							Т	Under-g	ıau 4	:)	MOIJ-	-major	40
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00		Electives							1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ſh
			P 0	210001102								respons				_	
			I 0	Other							1	-					
			? 4	Other													

Course-Section: PHYS 121 1 University of Maryland Title Introductory Physics I

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Cui,Lili Instructor: Enrollment: 552 St

Questionnaires: 154

Page 1186 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

a			A
Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Ou a mbil an		MD	277		eque		es 4	-		tructor		_	UMBC		Sect	
		Question	ns 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,sk		om this course	6	0	4	9	17	46	72	4.17	976/1509	4.17	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clea	r the ex	spected goals	7	0	5	9	30	44	59	3.97	1109/1509	3.97	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.97
		estions refle			6	0	7	9	23	40	69	4.05	907/1287	4.05	4.19	4.30	4.24	4.05
		ations reflec			8	43	10	9	20	30	34	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.11	4.22	4.11	3.67
	-	_		what you learned	6	11	6	7	15	42	67	4.15			4.01	4.09	4.02	4.15
				to what you learned	8	44	10	9	13	27	43		1001/1384		4.29	4.11	3.98	3.82
		g system clear		ained	7	0	3	7	19	41	77		- ,		4.22	4.17	4.20	4.24
		was class can			5	2	0	0	1		146	4.99	117/1506		4.72	4.67	4.66	4.99
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	30	1	11	11	37	47	17	3.39	1297/1463	3.39	4.03	4.09	4.02	3.39
		Lectu	re															
		actor's lectur			8	0	2	2	14	42	86	4.42	904/1438	4.42	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.42
		ctor seem inte			9	0	2	5	11	21	106	4.54	1130/1421	4.54	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.54
	Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0		14	31	47	47		1197/1411		4.19	4.31	4.27	3.77
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					0	14	17	23	41	51		1216/1405		4.29	4.32	4.27	3.67
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					7	9	10	21	28	69	4.01	664/1236	4.01	4.08	4.00	3.87	4.01
	Discussion																	
				what you learned	89	0	13	6	15	13	18	3.26	1118/1260	3.26	4.24	4.14	3.95	3.26
				ed to participate	91	0	5	5	7	15	31	3.98			4.59	4.33	4.15	3.98
				nd open discussion	92	0	6	3	14	11	28		1041/1258		4.45	4.38	4.18	3.84
4. Were s	special te	echniques succ	essful		90	4	7	7	12	10	24	3.62	667/ 873	3.62	4.19	4.03	3.89	3.62
		Labora	atory															
			_	of the material	153	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	3.99	4.16	4.06	****
				ground information		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 198		4.24	4.22	4.14	****
				for lab activities		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184		4.41	4.48	4.48	***
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provi	de assis	stance	153	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.46	4.36	4.29	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	}				
00-27	 14	0.00-0.99	 2	 A 45								0	Cradust		0			7
00-27 28-55	14 19	1.00-1.99	1	A 45 B 50		ке	quir	ea I	or M	ıa JOI	rs 10	0	Graduat	е	U	Majo	ıτ	/
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	8	C 19		General						3	Under-g	rad 15	54	Non-	major	147
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D 1	Concrat								3				3	
Grad.								ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons					
				- 0		0+	1					0			_			

Other

I

0

5

2

Course-Section: PHYS 122 1

Introductory Physics I

Instructor: Cui,Lili
Enrollment: 402

Questionnaires: 106

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1187 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eaue	ncie	:S		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
	_	General															
-	_	J ,	s from this course	0	0	13	5	22	29	37		1335/1509	3.68	4.36	4.31	4.18	3.68
			he expected goals	0	0	11	11	22	40	22		1378/1509	3.48	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.48
	_		the expected goals	0	0	9	10	22	31	34		1118/1287	3.67	4.19	4.30	4.24	3.67
			he expected goals	0	35	14	7	16	18	16		1394/1459	3.21	4.11	4.22	4.11	3.21
	_	-	e to what you learned	2	21	6	9	14	17	37	3.84		3.84	4.01	4.09	4.02	3.84
		gignments contrib system clearly	ute to what you learned	l 1 2	30 0	14 4	8 7	14 21	16 22	23 50	4.03	1260/1384 972/1489	3.35 4.03	4.29	4.11 4.17	3.98 4.20	3.35 4.03
		was class cancel	-	2	1	0	0	2 I		100		175/1506		4.22	4.17	4.20	4.03
	-		teaching effectiveness		1	21	14	31	25	6		1423/1463	2.80	4.72	4.07	4.00	2.80
9. HOW WO	dia you g	rade the overall	teaching effectiveness	, 0		21	14	31	23	O	2.00	1423/1403	2.00	4.03	4.03	4.02	2.00
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	0	0	7	7	12	35	45	3.98	1216/1438	3.98	4.52	4.46	4.44	3.98
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem interes	ted in the subject	0	0	4	3	11	23	65	4.34	1257/1421	4.34	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.34
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	and explained clearly	1	0	17	25	21	24	18	3.01	1361/1411	3.01	4.19	4.31	4.27	3.01
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute to	what you learned	0	0	27	13	22	14	30	3.07	1343/1405	3.07	4.29	4.32	4.27	3.07
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enha	nce your understanding	2	6	14	7	21	24	32	3.54	964/1236	3.54	4.08	4.00	3.87	3.54
		Discussi															
			e to what you learned	85	0	2	4	1	7	7		****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	3.95	****
		_	uraged to participate	85 86	0	3	3	2	6	7	3.52		****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:				0	4	3	4	4	5		****/1258	****	4.45	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were s	old the instructor encourage fair and open discuss: Were special techniques successful				3	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	3.89	****
		Laborato	rv														
1. Did th	e lab inc		ing of the material	105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	3.99	4.16	4.06	****
			background information		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 198	****	4.24	4.22	4.14	****
_	_	_	ble for lab activities		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184	****	4.41	4.48	4.48	****
	_	tructor provide		105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	4.46	4.36	4.29	****
		_	ts clearly specified	105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 165	****	4.22	4.18	4.15	****
		Self Pa				_											
			e to what you learned	105	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
			the expected goal	105	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	***	4.14	4.13	****
_		cts with the ins	_	105	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
		k/tutoring by pr	_	105	0	1 1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37 ****/ 30	****	++++	4.05	4.47	****
5. were t	nere enou	ign proctors for	all the students	105	0	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	***/ 30			4.27	4.21	
			Freq	quency	, Dis	trib	outio	n									
Credita E	arned	Expected Grades				Da	ason	ı c			Ty	ne			Majors		
CLEATER E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							.asul				ту.	 he			ria Jors	
00-27							ed f	or M	lajor	s 8	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	29	1.00-1.99	0 в 44														
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 1	0 C 22		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 10	16	Non-	major	105
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 1	8 D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	8 F 0	Electives							1	#### -				_	ıh
			Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot	her					1						
			? 2														

Course-Section: PHYS 122H 1 University of Maryland Page 1188 Title Honors Introductory Ph Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Cui, Lili

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Ω	1	Λ	1	2	1	3 40	1425/1509	3 40	4.36	4.31	4.18	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	٥	1		1433/1509		4.16	4.26	4.25	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	<u> </u>	0	0	1	2	0	2		1134/1287	3.60	4.19	4.30	4.24	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	0	1		1450/1459		4.11	4.22	1 11	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	U	1	1	1		1283/1406		4.01	4.09	4.02	3.25
-	•	7	Δ	0		1	7	4.67			4.29	4.11		4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2		225/1384				3.98	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	T	Τ	2	4.25	760/1489		4.22	4.17	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506		4.72	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1451/1463	2.25	4.03	4.09	4.02	2.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1381/1438	3.40	4.52	4.46	4.44	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2		1217/1421	4.40	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	1	٥		1399/1411	2.40	4.19	4.31	4 27	2.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80		2.80	4.29	4.32	4 27	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	U	1	3.20			4.08	4.00	3.87	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	Т	3	U		3.20	1000/1230	3.20	4.00	4.00	3.07	3.20

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 1

Introductory Physics L

Title Reno,Robert C Instructor:

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1189 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	Λ	0	Λ	6	16	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.36	4.31	4.18	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	621/1509	4.45	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	626/1287	4.41	4.19	4.30	4.24	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.11	4.22	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	702/1406	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	251/1384	4.63	4.29	4.11	3.98	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	121/1489	4.85	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	301/1463	4.54	4.03	4.09	4.02	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	559/1438	4.68	4.52	4.46	4.44	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	592/1411	4.53	4.19	4.31	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	733/1405	4.42	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	572/1236	4.15	4.08	4.00	3.87	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1258	****	4.45	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	37/ 184	4.67	3.99	4.16	4.06	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	43/ 198	4.65	4.24	4.22	4.14	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	84/ 184	4.65	4.41	4.48	4.48	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	46/ 177	4.75	4.46	4.36	4.29	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	46/ 165	4.56	4.22	4.18	4.15	4.56

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 224 1 University of Maryland Title Introductory Physics I Baltimore County

Instructor: De souza-machad

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1190

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	7	7	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.36	4.31	4.34	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	,	4.19	932/1509	4.19	4.16	4.26	4.32	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	1	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.19	4.30	4.35	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	2	0	8	2		1143/1459	3.83	4.11	4.22	4.30	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	934/1406		4.01	4.09	4.09	3.91
-	1	10	0	0	1	4	2	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	2	3	5	5		,				4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	•	•		_	1	1 -	4.94	1070/1489	3.94 4.94	4.22	4.17		3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	Ţ	0	0	0	0	T	15		408/1506		4.72	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	Т	U	0	5	5	Τ	3.64	1187/1463	3.64	4.03	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1185/1438	4.06	4.52	4.46	4.48	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1060/1421	4.63	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	8	1		1249/1411	3.63	4.19	4.31	4.37	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.29	4.32	4.39	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	824/1236		4.08	4.00	4.11	3.80
5. 214 dda15.12441 ccomit44cb cmance four anaciboanaing	_	_	ŭ	_	-	-		3.00	021, 1230	3.00	1.00	1.00		3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	4.19	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.37	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1258	****	4.45	4.38	4.44	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	itior	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 303 1 University of Maryland Title Thermal/Statistical Ph

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1191

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 23 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 3

Instructor:

McCann, Kevin J

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	. Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	734/1509	4.39	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.39
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	4	7	10	1	3.26	1432/1509		4.16	4.26	4.25	3.26
		uestions reflec		1 5	0	0	0	6	4	9	4		1174/1287		4.19	4.30	4.33	3.48
		uations reflect			0	7	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1227/1459	3.69	4.11	4.22	4.26	3.69
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	746/1406	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.12	4.10
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	13	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1083/1384	3.70	4.29	4.11	4.15	3.70
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	3	2	8	7	2	3.14	1393/1489	3.14	4.22	4.17	4.14	3.14
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	11	4	3.95	931/1463	3.95	4.03	4.09	4.08	3.95
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	Ο	3	6	14	4.48	839/1438	4.48	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.48
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	7	16	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.70
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	1	5	9	8		1030/1411	4.04	4.19	4.31	4.29	4.04
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	818/1405		4.29	4.32	4.32	4.35
				our understanding	1	1	1	1	3	11	5	3.86	799/1236		4.08	4.00		3.86
		_																
		Discus																
				what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1260		4.24	4.14	4.22	****
		_	_	d to participate	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1255		4.59	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.45	4.38	4.42	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	}
				·										- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 2	20	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7											_			_
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ge	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					1						

Course-Section: PHYS 304 1 University of Maryland Page 1192
Title Fundamentals of Astron Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: George, Ian M

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 26

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you	u gain ne	General w insights,skil	_	this course	0	0	0	1	4	 5	16	4.38	745/1509	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	2	11	10	3	3.54	1359/1509	3.54	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.54
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	9	12	5	3.85	1053/1287	3.85	4.19	4.30	4.33	3.85
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	11	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1119/1459	3.87	4.11	4.22	4.26	3.87
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ate to w	hat you learned	0	3	3	4	12	2	2	2.83	1367/1406	2.83	4.01	4.09	4.12	2.83
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	10	0	2	4	8	2	3.63	1132/1384	3.63	4.29	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	3	8	10	5	3.65	1241/1489	3.65	4.22	4.17	4.14	3.65
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	14	11	1	3.50	1485/1506	3.50	4.72	4.67	4.67	3.50
	-			ing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	9	13	2	3.64	1181/1463	3.64	4.03	4.09	4.08	3.64
3. Was led 4. Did the 5. Did aud 1. Did cla 2. Were al	repared the subject plained clearly ou learned ur understanding hat you learned to participate open discussion	1 1 1 1 1 24 24 24	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1	8 1 8 2 1	11 10 10 6	5 23 7 13 16	4.88 3.96 4.44 4.54 3.50 3.00	1297/1438 588/1421 1088/1411 708/1405 248/1236 ****/1255 ****/1258	4.88 3.96 4.44 4.54	4.52 4.82 4.19 4.29 4.08	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32 4.00 4.14 4.33 4.38	4.43 4.73 4.29 4.32 4.07 4.22 4.37 4.42	3.80 4.88 3.96 4.44 4.54 ****			
				Frequ	lency	Dis	tribu	ıtio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 7		Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	16	Non-	major	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es			1	5	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					2						

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 1 University of Ma
Title Optics Laboratory Baltimore Cou
Instructor: Pittman, Todd B. Fall 200

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1193

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24	
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

~					~										
				Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	193/1509	4.86	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.8
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	58/1509	4.95	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.9
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1287	****	4.19	4.30	4.33	***
4. Did other evaluat	ions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	116/1459	4.86	4.11	4.22	4.26	4.8
5. Did assigned read	lings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	656/1406	4.19	4.01	4.09	4.12	4.1
6. Did written assig	nments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	71/1384	4.91	4.29	4.11	4.15	4.9
7. Was the grading s	system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	175/1489	4.77	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.7
8. How many times wa	s class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.67	5.0
9. How would you gra	de the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	49/1463	4.94	4.03	4.09	4.08	4.9
	Lecture														
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.52	4.46	4.43	4.9
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.0
3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	69/1411	4.95	4.19	4.31	4.29	4.9
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	432/1405	4.68	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.6
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	520/1236	4.21	4.08	4.00	4.07	4.2
	Discussion														
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	4.22	***
	actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.37	***
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.45	4.38	4.42	***
4. Were special tech	niques successful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	4.08	***
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab incre	ease understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	16/ 184	4.89	3.99	4.16	4.07	4.8
2. Were you provided	with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	27/ 198	4.80	4.24	4.22	4.17	4.8
	terials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	16/ 184	4.95	4.41	4.48	4.52	4.9
_	ructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	16/ 177	4.95	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.9
	for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	31/ 165	4.75	4.22	4.18	4.11	4.75
	Freq	uency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 12		 Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	 aior	s 1		 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	20

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: PHYS 407 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1194

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Electromagnetic Theory Instructor: Gougousi, Theodo Fall 2009 Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							-	ncie		-		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain	new insights, skill	s from this cour	se	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.80
	uctor make clear t			0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	322/1509		4.16	4.26	4.26	4.70
	questions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.19	4.30	4.38	4.70
4. Did other eva	luations reflect t	he expected goal	S	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.11	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned	readings contribut	e to what you le	arned	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	623/1406	4.22	4.01	4.09	4.11	4.22
6. Did written a	ssignments contrib	ute to what you	learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.29	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the gradi	ng system clearly	explained		0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.22	4.17	4.18	4.40
-	s was class cancel			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you	grade the overall	teaching effect	iveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	786/1463	4.11	4.03	4.09	4.18	4.11
	Lecture			0	0	0											
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	3	7		545/1438		4.52	4.46	4.50	4.70
	3						0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	3	6	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.35	4.50
		-		0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	419/1405		4.29	4.32	4.34	4.70
5. Did audiovisu	al techniques enha	nce your underst	anding	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1236	****	4.08	4.00	4.03	****
	Discussi	an an															
1 Did alaga dia	cussions contribut		arnod	8	0	0	0	Λ	0	2	E 00	****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	4.25	****
	ents actively enco	_		8	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1255		4.59	4.14	4.46	****
	uctor encourage fa	_	_	8	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1258		4.45	4.38		****
5. Did the insti	uccor encourage ra	ii and open disc	ussion	O	U	U	U		U		4.00	/1250		1.13	1.50	1.31	
			Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0	0.00-0.99	 0 A	3		Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	aior	s	9	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	9
28-55 0	1.00-1.99	0 в	5			-			,								
56-83 0	2.00-2.99	0 C	1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	1
84-150 4	3.00-3.49	1 D	0													-	
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00	5 F	0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
		P	0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	it	
		I	0		Oth	her					0						
		?	0														

Course-Section: PHYS 430 1 University of Maryland Page 1195 Title Introduction To Materi Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Takacs,Laszlo Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u qain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1331/1509	3.60	4.16	4.26	4.26	3.60
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	4.19	4.30	4.38	3.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.00	4.11	4.22	4.32	3.00
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1299/1406	3.20	4.01	4.09	4.11	3.20
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1017/1384	3.80	4.29	4.11	4.23	3.80
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.22	4.17	4.18	3.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.18	4.00
	Lecture ere the instructor's lectures well prepared																	
1. Were t						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did the	d the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	s lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1309/1411	3.40	4.19	4.31	4.35	3.40
4. Did the	d the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1241/1405	3.60	4.29	4.32	4.34	3.60
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:				0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1236	4.80	4.08	4.00	4.03	4.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	4.24	4.14	4.25	3.50
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	783/1255	4.25	4.59	4.33	4.46	4.25
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1070/1258	3.75	4.45	4.38	4.51	3.75
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		1	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	853/ 873	2.50	4.19	4.03	4.26	2.50
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	 A 1					or Ma			1	 Graduat		 2	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		ле	4urr.	eu I	JI Ma	JOES		_	Graduat	C	4	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	G 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 1		00	c.a.	-				J	onaci -g	Luu	5	14011		5
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		r1	ecti	17AC				2	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grad.	4	3.30-4.00	2	P 0		15.1	CCLI	vca				4	respons				_	111
				I O		O+	her					0	I CBPOIIB	CD CO L	,c 5191.	ıııcaı		
				1 0		OL	1101					U						

Course-Section: PHYS 431L 1 Title

Modern Physics Lab

Instructor: Wu,E S Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1196 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	IIMRC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	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	2	0	3	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	4.16	4.26	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1287	****	4.19	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1342/1459	3.40	4.11	4.22	4.32	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.01	4.09	4.11	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1382/1489	3.20	4.22	4.17	4.18	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1257/1421	4.33	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.35	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1306/1405	3.33	4.29	4.32	4.34	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1236	****	4.08	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion	_				_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	1		1102/1260	3.33	4.24	4.14	4.25	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.59	4.33	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	0		1102/1258	3.67	4.45	4.38	4.51	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	95/ 184	4.20	3.99	1 16	4.62	4.20
<u> </u>	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80				4.16 4.22	4.62	3.80
 Were you provided with adequate background information Were necessary materials available for lab activities 	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	158/ 198 124/ 184	3.80 4.40	4.24	4.22		
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	1		4.20	124/ 104	4.40	4.41	4.46	4.66 4.47	4.40 4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	144/ 165	3.40	4.22	4.18	4.47	3.40
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified		U	U		2			3.40	144/ 103	3.40	7.22	T.10	1.27	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.67	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	4.70	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.82	4.38	4.64	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	4.90	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
. 10 - 1														
Self Paced	_	0	•	0	-	0	0	2 00		****	4.4.4.2	1 05	4 65	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49		****	4.26	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5 5	0	0	1	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37 ****/ 30	****	****	4.05 4.27	4.67 4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	U	U	Т	U	U	U	∠.00	/ 30			4.2/	4.33	

Course-Section: PHYS 431L 1 Title

Modern Physics Lab

Instructor: Wu,E S Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1196 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Sectio	on: PHYS 450 8	University of Maryland
Title	Special Topics	Baltimore County
Instructor:	Martins, Jose V	Fall 2009

Course-Section	n: PHYS 450 8	University of Maryland	Page 1197
Title	Special Topics	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Martins,Jose V	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	3		

Quebelonnalieb. 3 Deducine course systematic	Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnair
--	-----------------	---	--

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		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	2	0	3.67	1340/1509	3.67	4.36	4.31	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1419/1509	3.33	4.16	4.26	4.26	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	4.03	4.09	4.18	3.67

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

Course-Section: PHYS 480 1

Tech In Theoretical Ph

Title Georganopoulos,

Instructor:

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1198 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fr 1	_	ncies 3	s 4	5		tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
		NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	598/1509		4.36	4.31		4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	356/1509		4.16	4.26	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	519/1287		4.19	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	400/1459		4.11	4.22	4.32	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	181/1406		4.01	4.09	4.11	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	260/1384	4.63	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	364/1489	4.58	4.22	4.17	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	294/1463	4.55	4.03	4.09	4.18	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.52	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	520/1411	4.58	4.19	4.31	4.35	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	3	8	4.73	381/1405	4.73	4.29	4.32	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1179/1236	2.75	4.08	4.00	4.03	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1260	****	4.24	4.14	4.25	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1255	****	4.59	4.33	4.46	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1258	****	4.45	4.38	4.51	***
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	3.99	4.16	4.62	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.24	4.22	4.37	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.41	4.48	4.66	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.46	4.36	4.47	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.22	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.67	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.70	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92		4.82	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 93		4.90	4.06	4.32	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****

Course-Section: PHYS 480 1

Title Tech In Theoretical Ph

Instructor: Georganopoulos,

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1198 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Course-Section: PHYS 601 1 Univer
Title Quantum Mechanics Bal
Instructor: Franson, James D
Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 8

Page 1199 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

Ouestions								_	ncies		_		ructor		_		Level	
		Question	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	668/1287	4.38	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.38
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.11	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.01	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	421/1384	4.43	4.29	4.11	4.16	4.43
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.75
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.88
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.33
		Lectur	e															
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1438		4.52	4.46	4.49	5.00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421		4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1	7		169/1411		4.19	4.31	4.33	4.88
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.29	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1236	4.25	4.08	4.00	3.98	4.25
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1260		4.24	4.14	4.21	****
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1255		4.59	4.33	4.43	****
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1258		4.45	4.38	4.50	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	4.01	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 1	A 5		Par			or Ma	iore		7	Graduat		2	Majo		5
28-55							4 a T T C	Lu I	J⊥ 110	، ١٠٠١	,	,	Graduati	_	۷	Ma JC) <u>+</u>	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001	u.	-				•	onacı g.		~	1,011		3
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E] e	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	-	3.30 1.00	0	P 0							0 #### - Means there are not enough		_					
I O						Ot.l	ner					0	10050110		51			
								-										

Course-Section: PHYS 602 1 University of Maryland Page 1200 Baltimore County Fall 2009 MAR 22, 2010 Title Statistical Mechanics Job IRBR3029

McCann, Kevin J

Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 8

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	E varaacron	Queberonnarie

			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	7	4.88	184/1509	4.88	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1287	4.88	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.11	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	986/1406	3.83	4.01	4.09	4.12	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1384	4.83	4.29	4.11	4.16	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	109/1489	4.88	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.50
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.52	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.88	4.19	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.29	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	199/1236	4.63	4.08	4.00	3.98	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	558/1260	4.33	4.24	4.14	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.59	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.45	4.38	4.50	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.19	4.03	4.01	****
Frequ			rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: PHYS 606 1 University of Maryland Title Classical Mechanics Terra

Baltimore County Fall 2009

11010	CIUDDICUI
Instructor:	Worchesky,T
Enrollment:	12

Questionnaires: 10

Page 1201 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions 				NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vo	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.40
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	5	3		1013/1509	4.10	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.10
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	826/1287	4.20	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.20
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	3	2	4		,	4.11	4.11	4.22	4.16	4.11
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	0		1213/1406		4.01	4.09	4.12	3.44
	_	_		o what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	734/1384	4.13	4.29	4.11	4.16	4.13
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.40
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1101/1463	3.75	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.75
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.52	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.82	4.73	4.78	4.89
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	911/1411	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.33	4.22
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.33
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	****	4.08	4.00	3.98	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.24	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.59	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.45	4.38	4.50	4.60
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27							auir		 or Ms	iore		 6	Graduat		4	Majo		8
	00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					Required for Majors 6					Graduat	_	1	ı ıa je	<i>,</i> _	O		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	2
84-150								_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		-
Grad.	01 100 0 0.00 0.10 1					Ele	ecti [.]	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ah
P 0															gnificant		,	
	P 0 I 0					Ot1	her					0	-					

Course-Section: PHYS 609 1
Title Modern Optics
Instructor: Shih,Yan-hua
Enrollment: 2

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

D 0

0

0

0

F 0

I

Questionnaires: 2

84-150

Grad.

0

2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1202 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Question	5 			INA				-1 		Mean	Ralik		Mean	Mean	Mean	меан
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.16	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.11	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.01	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.15	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.52	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.19	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.29	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1219/1236	2.00	4.08	4.00	3.98	2.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.24	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.59	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.19	4.03	4.01	5.00
	Fre				ency.	Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 2 B 0		кес	quire	ea fo	or Ma	ijors	3	T	Graduat	е	2	Majo	r	2
56-83					Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	major	0	

Electives

Other

0

1

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 621 1

Atmos Physics I

Sparling, Lynn C

4

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Page 1203 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.11	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.01	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	d 0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1192/1384	3.50	4.29	4.11	4.16	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1205/1506	4.33	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.52	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.29	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.08	4.00	3.98	4.50
Fre	quency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	2	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	Electives 0		0 #### - Means there			
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				2	0							

Course-Section: PHYS 631 1 University of Maryland Page 1204 Title The Physics Of Astroph Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title The Physics Of Astroph Baltimore County
Instructor: Henriksen, Mark Fall 2009

D 0

F 0

P 0

0

I 0

Enrollment:	6	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

3.00-3.49 0

3.50-4.00 1

84-150

Grad.

0

4

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1228/1509	3.80	4.16	4.26	4.25	3.80
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.11	4.22	4.16	4.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1258/1406	3.33	4.01	4.09	4.12	3.33
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.29	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1354/1463	3.20	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.20
		Lectur																
1 Wara +1	ho inata			nwanawad	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2 60	1358/1438	3.60	4.52	4.46	4.49	3.60
		uctor's lecture ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.49	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	1		1361/1411	3.00	4.02	4.73	4.76	3.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	7	1	1		1294/1405	3.40	4.19	4.31	4.33	3.40
				you rearned your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	274/1236		4.29	4.00	3.98	4.50
J. Dia aa	aiovibaa.	r ccciniiqueb en	ilanice j	our underbeanding	Ü	3	J	J	J	_	_	1.50	2,1,1250	1.50	1.00	1.00	3.70	1.50
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	4	Majo	 r	5
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1						_			-						_		
56-83						Ger	nera!	L				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	0

Electives

Other

5

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 690 1 Prof Skills Phys Hayden,L M

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

11

University of Maryland Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1205

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	S 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect
	General				NR	NA						меан	Raiik	Mean	меан	меан	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.73
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	289/1509	4.73	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.73
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	141/1459		4.11	4.22	4.16	4.82
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	563/1406	4.27	4.01	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	251/1384	4.64	4.29	4.11	4.16	4.64
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	216/1489	4.73	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.73
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	965/1506		4.72	4.67	4.71	4.64
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.50
		Discus																
	Did class discussions contribute to what you lea				1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	209/1260		4.24		4.21	4.80
	. Were all students actively encouraged to particip . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus				1	0	0	0	0	3	7		412/1255		4.59	4.33	4.43	4.70
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258		4.45	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	sstul		1	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	83/ 873	4.86	4.19	4.03	4.01	4.86
1 Mana a		Semina	_		1	1	0	0	1	0	0	4 70	41/ 00	4 70	1 67	4 40	4 20	4 70
				announced theme	1	Ţ	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	41/ 89 58/ 92		4.67	4.49	4.39	4.78 4.50
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1 0	3	6 7	4.50 4.70	37/ 90		4.50 4.70	4.54	4.52	4.70
		ons contribute			1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.70	19/ 92		4.70	4.38	4.40	4.70
		for grading mad			1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	18/ 93		4.02	4.36	4.04	4.80
5. Wele Ci	riteria i	or grading mad	e Clear		Т	U	U	U	U	2	0	4.00	10/ 93	4.00	4.90	4.00	4.04	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	8
00-27	0-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 3		A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor		9	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	8	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			_			-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	#### - Means there are not end		enoug	gh		
	P 6			P 6									respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					0						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Course-Section: PHYS 698 1 University of Maryland Page 1206 Title Physics Seminar MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: McMillan, Willia Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questi	ons		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Gene	 ^al																
1. Did you gain new insights,s		m this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1032/15	0.9	4.11	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.11
2. Did the instructor make cle			1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	992/15		4.13	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions refl		_	0	5	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	779/12		4.25	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.25
4. Did other evaluations refle			0	2	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	979/14		4.00	4.11	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contr		_	0	6	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	813/14	06	4.00	4.01	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments con		_	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	260/13	84	4.63	4.29	4.11	4.16	4.63
7. Was the grading system clea	rly expla	ined	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	674/14	89	4.33	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class ca	ncelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	820/15	06	4.78	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the ove	call teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	853/14	63	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lect	ıra																
1. Were the instructor's lectu		prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/14	3 B	4.67	4.52	4.46	4.49	4.67
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	2		****/14		****	4.82	4.73	4.78	****
	_	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/14		****	4.19	4.31	4.33	****	
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	1		****/14		****	4.29	4.32	4.33	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques		-	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/12		****	4.08	4.00	3.98	****
-	-	3															
	ussion																
1. Did class discussions contr		-	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/12		****	4.24	4.14	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively			8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/12		****	4.59	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourag		d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/12		****	4.45	4.38	4.50	****
4. Were special techniques suc	cessful		8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 8	73	****	4.19	4.03	4.01	****
Semi	nar																
1. Were assigned topics releva	nt to the	announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	56/	89	4.57	4.67	4.49	4.39	4.57
2. Was the instructor availabl	e for ind	lividual attention	2	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	58/	92	4.50	4.50	4.54	4.52	4.50
3. Did research projects contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	90	****	4.70	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribut	e to what	you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	17/	92	4.83	4.82	4.38	4.30	4.83
5. Were criteria for grading m	ade clear	•	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	93	5.00	4.90	4.06	4.04	5.00
	iencv	7 Dist	trib	ution	ı												
		_	2														
Credits Earned Cum. G	PA 	Expected Grades	ades Reas									Тур	e 			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	6	Gradu	ate		4	Majo	r	7
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0 Under-			-grad 5		Non-	major	2

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors				
00-27 1		0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	4	Major	7		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0								
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F 0 Electives		Electives	0 #### - Means there are no			are not enough	not enough		
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant			
				I	0	Other	0						
				2	2								

Course-Section: PHYS 707 1 University of Maryland Page 1207 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Adv Electromagnetic Th

Instructor: Kramer,Ivan

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Tnat	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
0	NTD	3.7.7	1	-			_				_	-		
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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	5	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.36	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	857/1287	4.14	4.19	4.30	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.11	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1406	4.86	4.01	4.09	4.12	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.29	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	291/1438	4.86	4.52	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	351/1411	4.71	4.19	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	733/1405	4.43	4.29	4.32	4.33	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.24	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.59	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.19	4.03	4.01	5.00

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

University of Maryland

Course-Section: PHYS 721 1 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Title Atmos Radiation Martins, Jose V Instructor: Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Page 1208 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Co	ourse Eva	luation Q	uestionnaire
------------	-----------	-----------	--------------

								_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.16	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.19	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.11	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to v	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.01	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.33
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.67
		Lecture																
		actor's lecture:	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1438		4.52		4.49	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
		-		plained clearly	1		0	0		0	2		1/1411	5.00	4.19	4.31	4.33	5.00
		es contribute to	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1405	5.00	4.29	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisua.	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.08	4.00	3.98	4.67
		Discus																
1 Did ala	aa diaa			hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	E 00	4.24	1 11	4 21	E 00
				hat you learned to participate	2		0	0	0	0	1		1/1260 1/1255		4.24	4.14	4.21 4.43	5.00 5.00
				l open discussion	2	-	0	0	0	0	1		1/1255		4.45		4.43	
3. DIG the	e Instruc	ctor encourage .	Lair and	open discussion	2	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.50	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons							Type			Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	3	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		a		1				0	TTm day		2	Mar		2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	3
84-150 Grad.	0 1	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0 2	D 0 F 0		ъл.	ecti					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	*** ***	02011	·h
Grad.	Τ	3.50-4.00	4	P 0		r16	=CL1	ves				U	respons				_	111
					O+1	ner					0	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcan	I L		
I 0					ULI	161					U							
				f U														