```
Course-Section: PHYS 105  1                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1183
Title      Ideas In Astronomy                    Baltimore County                                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   George,Ian M                       Fall   2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   45
Questionnaires: 22                      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   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   982/1509  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    0   7   0   2   4   3   6  3.87  1119/1459  3.87  4.11  4.22  4.11  3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   1   0   6   2  10  4.05   776/1406  4.05  4.01  4.09  4.02  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  1   1   1   2   7  4.08   762/1384  4.08  4.29  4.11  3.98  4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   3   6   4   7  3.62  1258/1489  3.62  4.22  4.17  4.20  3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   1   8  13   0  3.55  1483/1506  3.55  4.72  4.67  4.66  3.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1   0   6   7   5  3.79  1076/1463  3.79  4.03  4.09  4.02  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
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  0   1   0   0   3  4.25  ****/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 18 0 0   0   1   0   3  4.50  ****/1258  ****  4.45  4.38  4.18  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  18   2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 873  ****  4.19  4.03  3.89  ****


              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  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  4.41  4.48  4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 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
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  ****  4.50  4.54  4.16  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  90  ****  4.70  4.50  4.21  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.82  4.38  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  ****


              Field Work
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   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.29  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.53  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.12  ****


              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  ****
```

Title         Ideas In Astronomy                        Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   George,Ian M                              Fall   2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires:  22                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                      Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2        0.00-0.99   1         A    7        Required for Majors  7     Graduate     0      Major        3
 28-55     2        1.00-1.99   0         B    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
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                2
                                          ?    1

```
Course-Section: PHYS 111  1                     University of Maryland                              Page 1184
Title       Basic Physics I                     Baltimore County                                    MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Anderson,Eric C                     Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    454
Questionnaires:  95                   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   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
1. 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  795/1260  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  974/1255  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  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  38   0  11   8   9  16  13  3.21  174/ 184  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  4.05  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
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 89  2   0   1   0   1   2  4.00 ****/  89  ****  4.67  4.49 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 90 1  0   1   0   2   1  3.75 ****/  92  ****  4.50  4.54 4.16  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 91 1   0   1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/  90  ****  4.70  4.50 4.21  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    91   1   0   1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/  92  ****  4.82  4.38 4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                91   1   0   1   0   1   1  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 ****/  47  ****  ****  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  ****  ****  4.32 4.12  ****


              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  3.50 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 4.21  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 21 | Required for Majors | 62 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 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 | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

```
Course-Section: PHYS 112  1                      University of Maryland                                    Page 1185
Title      Basic Physics II                       Baltimore County                                        MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Anderson,Eric C                     Fall   2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    160
Questionnaires:  46                       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  2  3 10  29  4.50  598/1509  4.50 4.36  4.31 4.18  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  1  5  8  30  4.52  519/1509  4.52 4.16  4.26 4.25  4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  1  4  7  32  4.59  435/1287  4.59 4.19  4.30 4.24  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  19  2  2  1  7  13  4.08  924/1459  4.08 4.11  4.22 4.11  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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
6. Did written assignments contribute 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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  2  0  4  6  31  4.49  485/1489  4.49 4.22  4.17 4.20  4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   1  0  0  0  1  40  4.98  175/1506  4.98 4.72  4.67 4.66  4.98
9. How would you grade the overall 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 the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  1  2  40  4.91  219/1438  4.91 4.52  4.46 4.44  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented 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 the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   1  0  1  2  9  29  4.61  540/1405  4.61 4.29  4.32 4.27  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  2  0  1  3 10  24  4.50  274/1236  4.50 4.08  4.00 3.87  4.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 39  0  0  0  0  2   5  4.71 ****/1260  **** 4.24  4.14 3.95  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 39  0  0  0  0  2   5  4.71 ****/1255  **** 4.59  4.33 4.15  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 39 0  0  0  0  1   6  4.86 ****/1258  **** 4.45  4.38 4.18  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  39   2  0  0  1  1   3  4.40 ****/ 873  **** 4.19  4.03 3.89  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17   0  3  8  7  8   3  3.00  179/ 184  3.00 3.99  4.16 4.06  3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 1 12  6  10  3.86  155/ 198  3.86 4.24  4.22 4.14  3.86
3. Were necessary materials available 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 the lab instructor provide assistance           18   0  1  2  4  6  15  4.14  132/ 177  4.14 4.46  4.36 4.29  4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  17 12  0  3  1  5   8  4.06  101/ 165  4.06 4.22  4.18 4.15  4.06


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/  49  **** ****  4.26 4.28  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    45   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.14 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      45   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  46  **** ****  4.31 4.52  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned      Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons               Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2      0.00-0.99   0      A   14      Required for Majors  31    Graduate     1      Major        0
28-55     3      1.00-1.99   0      B   15
56-83     8      2.00-2.99   3      C    5      General               1    Under-grad  45      Non-major   46
84-150    5      3.00-3.49   6      D    0
Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   9      F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                               responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other                 1
                                     ?    4
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 121  1                    University of Maryland                                      Page 1186
Title        Introductory Physics I            Baltimore County                                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Cui,Lili                          Fall  2009                                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  552
Questionnaires: 154                    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    6   0   4   9  17  46  72  4.17  976/1509  4.17 4.36 4.31 4.18 4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     7   0   5   9  30  44  59  3.97 1109/1509  3.97 4.16 4.26 4.25 3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    6   0   7   9  23  40  69  4.05  907/1287  4.05 4.19 4.30 4.24 4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     8  43  10   9  20  30  34  3.67 1238/1459  3.67 4.11 4.22 4.11 3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  11   6   7  15  42  67  4.15  702/1406  4.15 4.01 4.09 4.02 4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 44  10   9  13  27  43  3.82 1001/1384  3.82 4.29 4.11 3.98 3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             7   0   3   7  19  41  77  4.24  781/1489  4.24 4.22 4.17 4.20 4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                   5   2   0   0   1   0 146  4.99  117/1506  4.99 4.72 4.67 4.66 4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 30 1  11  11  37  47  17  3.39 1297/1463  3.39 4.03 4.09 4.02 3.39


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8   0   2   2  14  42  86  4.42  904/1438  4.42 4.52 4.46 4.44 4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    9   0   2   5  11  21 106  4.54 1130/1421  4.54 4.82 4.73 4.66 4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8   0   7  14  31  47  47  3.77 1197/1411  3.77 4.19 4.31 4.27 3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8   0  14  17  23  41  51  3.67 1216/1405  3.67 4.29 4.32 4.27 3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 7   9  10  21  28  69  4.01  664/1236  4.01 4.08 4.00 3.87 4.01


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 89  0  13   6  15  13  18  3.26 1118/1260  3.26 4.24 4.14 3.95 3.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 91  0   5   5   7  15  31  3.98  921/1255  3.98 4.59 4.33 4.15 3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 92 0   6   3  14  11  28  3.84 1041/1258  3.84 4.45 4.38 4.18 3.84
4. Were special techniques successful                   90  4   7   7  12  10  24  3.62  667/ 873  3.62 4.19 4.03 3.89 3.62


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  153  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 184  **** 3.99 4.16 4.06 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 153 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 198  **** 4.24 4.22 4.14 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 153 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 184  **** 4.41 4.48 4.48 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           153  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 177  **** 4.46 4.36 4.29 ****

                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                   Majors

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     14      0.00-0.99     2      A   45       Required for Majors 108     Graduate      0       Major        7
 28-55     19      1.00-1.99     1      B   50
 56-83     16      2.00-2.99     8      C   19       General             3       Under-grad  154       Non-major  147
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    10      D    1
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    35      F    0       Electives           1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               2
                                        ?    5
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 122  1                     University of Maryland                                    Page 1187
Title          Introductory Physics I           Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Cui,Lili                          Fall  2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    402
Questionnaires: 106                         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  13   5  22  29  37  3.68 1335/1509  3.68  4.36  4.31  4.18  3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  11  11  22  40  22  3.48 1378/1509  3.48  4.16  4.26  4.25  3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   9  10  22  31  34  3.67 1118/1287  3.67  4.19  4.30  4.24  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  35  14   7  16  18  16  3.21 1394/1459  3.21  4.11  4.22  4.11  3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  21   6   9  14  17  37  3.84  979/1406  3.84  4.01  4.09  4.02  3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 30  14   8  14  16  23  3.35 1260/1384  3.35  4.29  4.11  3.98  3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   4   7  21  22  50  4.03  972/1489  4.03  4.22  4.17  4.20  4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0   3 100  4.97  175/1506  4.97  4.72  4.67  4.66  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1  21  14  31  25   6  2.80 1423/1463  2.80  4.03  4.09  4.02  2.80


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor'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 the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material 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 the lectures 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6  14   7  21  24  32  3.54  964/1236  3.54  4.08  4.00  3.87  3.54


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 85  0   2   4   1   7   7  3.62 ****/1260  ****  4.24  4.14  3.95  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 85  0   3   3   2   6   7  3.52 ****/1255  ****  4.59  4.33  4.15  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 86 0   4   3   4   4   5  3.15 ****/1258  ****  4.45  4.38  4.18  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  88   3   3   1   2   2   7  3.60 ****/ 873  ****  4.19  4.03  3.89  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 105   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 184  ****  3.99  4.16  4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 105 0 1  0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.24  4.22  4.14  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 105 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 184  ****  4.41  4.48  4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          105   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 177  ****  4.46  4.36  4.29  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 105   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 165  ****  4.22  4.18  4.15  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 105 0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  4.28  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   105   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14  4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     105   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  4.52  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      105   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05  4.47  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    105   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27  4.21  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0      A   21          Required for Majors  81     Graduate     0       Major        1
 28-55     29        1.00-1.99    0      B   44
 56-83     11        2.00-2.99   10      C   22          General               3     Under-grad 106       Non-major  105
 84-150     7        3.00-3.49   18      D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   28      F    0          Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                        I    0          Other                 1
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 122H 1              University of Maryland                        Page 1188
Title         Honors Introductory Ph      Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Cui,Lili                    Fall   2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
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  1  0  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  0  1  3.25 1433/1509  3.25  4.16  4.26  4.25  3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  0  2  3.60 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  2.80 1450/1459  2.80  4.11  4.22  4.11  2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 1283/1406  3.25  4.01  4.09  4.02  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  225/1384  4.67  4.29  4.11  3.98  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  760/1489  4.25  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  5.00  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  4.40 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  0  2.40 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 1376/1405  2.80  4.29  4.32  4.27  2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  1  3  0  1  3.20 1088/1236  3.20  4.08  4.00  3.87  3.20


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 122L 1                      University of Maryland                                    Page 1189
Title        Introductory Physics L              Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Reno,Robert C                       Fall  2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  66
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    1   0   0  0  0  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

                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0       0.00-0.99    0       A   13    Required for Majors  14    Graduate     0      Major       11
  28-55    4       1.00-1.99    0       B    5                               Under-grad  23      Non-major   12
  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
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0    Other                 2
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 224  1                     University of Maryland                              Page 1190
Title       Introductory Physics I              Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  De souza-machad                    Fall  2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
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   2   0  0  0  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   5  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   4  4.00  924/1287  4.00 4.19  4.30 4.35  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   3  0  2  0  8   2  3.83 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  3.91 4.01  4.09 4.09  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10  0  0  1  2   3  4.33  531/1384  4.33 4.29  4.11 4.09  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  2  3  5   6  3.94 1070/1489  3.94 4.22  4.17 4.19  3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94  408/1506  4.94 4.72  4.67 4.61  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0  0  5  5   1  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  3.63 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  3.80 4.08  4.00 4.11  3.80


                 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  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 303  1                    University of Maryland                              Page 1191
Title      Thermal/Statistical Ph              Baltimore County                                    MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   McCann,Kevin J                   Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   32
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  3  8 12  4.39  734/1509   4.39  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  4  7 10  1  3.26 1432/1509   3.26  4.16  4.26  4.25  3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  6  4  9  4  3.48 1174/1287   3.48  4.19  4.30  4.33  3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   7  0  2  4  7  3  3.69 1227/1459   3.69  4.11  4.22  4.26  3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained             0   1  3  2  8  7  2  3.14 1393/1489   3.14  4.22  4.17  4.14  3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00    1/1506   5.00  4.72  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  1  3 11  4  3.95  931/1463   3.95  4.03  4.09  4.08  3.95


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  3  6 14  4.48  839/1438   4.48  4.52  4.46  4.43  4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  7 16  4.70  979/1421   4.70  4.82  4.73  4.73  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  5  9  8  4.04 1030/1411   4.04  4.19  4.31  4.29  4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  1  3  6 13  4.35  818/1405   4.35  4.29  4.32  4.32  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  1  1  3 11  5  3.86  799/1236   3.86  4.08  4.00  4.07  3.86


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1260   ****  4.24  4.14  4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1255   ****  4.59  4.33  4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1258   ****  4.45  4.38  4.42  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0      0.00-0.99   0       A   4      Required for Majors  20    Graduate     0      Major        18
  28-55    0      1.00-1.99   0       B   7
  56-83    5      2.00-2.99   3       C   5      General              0     Under-grad   23     Non-major     5
  84-150   8      3.00-3.49   6       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                1
                                      ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 304  1                     University of Maryland                              Page 1192
Title           Fundamentals of Astron           Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:     George,Ian M                     Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires: 26                      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   4   5  16  4.38  745/1509  4.38  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   9  12   5  3.85 1053/1287  3.85  4.19  4.30  4.33  3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11   0   1   5   4   5  3.87 1119/1459  3.87  4.11  4.22  4.26  3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   3   8  10   5  3.65 1241/1489  3.65  4.22  4.17  4.14  3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0  14  11   1  3.50 1485/1506  3.50  4.72  4.67  4.67  3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   1   9  13   2  3.64 1181/1463  3.64  4.03  4.09  4.08  3.64


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   8  11   5  3.80 1297/1438  3.80  4.52  4.46  4.43  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   1   1  23  4.88  588/1421  4.88  4.82  4.73  4.73  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   8  10   7  3.96 1088/1411  3.96  4.19  4.31  4.29  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   2  10  13  4.44  708/1405  4.44  4.29  4.32  4.32  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  0   1   1   6  16  4.54  248/1236  4.54  4.08  4.00  4.07  4.54


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/1260  ****  4.24  4.14  4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0  0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/1255  ****  4.59  4.33  4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/1258  ****  4.45  4.38  4.42  ****
```

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 7 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 15 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

```
Course-Section: PHYS 330L 1                      University of Maryland                           Page 1193
Title      Optics Laboratory                     Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Pittman,Todd B.                     Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  22                     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  19  4.86  193/1509  4.86  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1  21  4.95   58/1509  4.95  4.16  4.26  4.25  4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  18   0   0   0   0   4  5.00  ****/1287  ****  4.19  4.30  4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86  116/1459  4.86  4.11  4.22  4.26  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   0   4   9   8  4.19  656/1406  4.19  4.01  4.09  4.12  4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   0   2  20  4.91   71/1384  4.91  4.29  4.11  4.15  4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   5  17  4.77  175/1489  4.77  4.22  4.17  4.14  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.72  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0   0   0   1  17  4.94   49/1463  4.94  4.03  4.09  4.08  4.94


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2  20  4.91  219/1438  4.91  4.52  4.46  4.43  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.82  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1  21  4.95   69/1411  4.95  4.19  4.31  4.29  4.95
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  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6   1   0   1   5   7  4.21  520/1236  4.21  4.08  4.00  4.07  4.21


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1260  ****  4.24  4.14  4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1255  ****  4.59  4.33  4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1258  ****  4.45  4.38  4.42  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 873  ****  4.19  4.03  4.08  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   2   2   0   0   0   2  16  4.89   16/ 184  4.89  3.99  4.16  4.07  4.89
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  4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2  0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95   16/ 184  4.95  4.41  4.48  4.52  4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            2   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95   16/ 177  4.95  4.46  4.36  4.30  4.95
5. Were requirements 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

                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A   12         Required for Majors  19     Graduate     0        Major        20
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    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 enough
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                 0
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 407  1                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1194
Title       Electromagnetic Theory             Baltimore County                                        MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Gougousi,Theodo                  Fall   2009                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
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  2  8  4.80  244/1509  4.80  4.36  4.31  4.39  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  322/1509  4.70  4.16  4.26  4.26  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  326/1287  4.70  4.19  4.30  4.38  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     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 contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  623/1406  4.22  4.01  4.09  4.11  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1384  ****  4.29  4.11  4.23  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  597/1489  4.40  4.22  4.17  4.18  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                   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 effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  6  2  4.11  786/1463  4.11  4.03  4.09  4.18  4.11


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  545/1438  4.70  4.52  4.46  4.50  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.82  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  617/1411  4.50  4.19  4.31  4.35  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  419/1405  4.70  4.29  4.32  4.34  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  8  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1236  ****  4.08  4.00  4.03  ****


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1260  ****  4.24  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1255  ****  4.59  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1258  ****  4.45  4.38  4.51  ****


                              Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
                                                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   0   1   3  4.00 1114/1509  4.00 4.36  4.31 4.39   4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   3   0   1  3.00 1247/1287  3.00 4.19  4.30 4.38   3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   1   0   1   2   0  3.00 1422/1459  3.00 4.11  4.22 4.32   3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   1   1   1  3.00 1403/1489  3.00 4.22  4.17 4.18   3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1506  5.00 4.72  4.67 4.67   5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   0   3   0  4.00  853/1463  4.00 4.03  4.09 4.18   4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  363/1438  4.80 4.52  4.46 4.50   4.80
2. Did 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   0   1   2   1  3.40 1309/1411  3.40 4.19  4.31 4.35   3.40
4. Did 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   1   4  4.80  100/1236  4.80 4.08  4.00 4.03   4.80


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  1   2   1   0   0   1   0  2.50  853/ 873  2.50 4.19  4.03 4.26   2.50
```

                           Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 431L 1                  University of Maryland                              Page 1196
Title        Modern Physics Lab              Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Wu,E S                          Fall  2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
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   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  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  3.33  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  3.67  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  4.16 4.62  4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80   158/ 198  3.80 4.24  4.22 4.37  3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   124/ 184  4.40 4.41  4.48 4.66  4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1   0  0  1  0  1  3  4.20   125/ 177  4.20 4.46  4.36 4.47  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 4.29  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  2.00  ****/  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  ****


              Self  Paced
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   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  37  **** ****  4.05 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     5   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/  30  **** ****  4.27 4.33  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 431L 1                     University of Maryland                          Page 1196
Title          Modern Physics Lab                 Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Wu,E S                             Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  6                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: 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
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 | 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 |

## 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     | 3 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 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 | | | |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 2 |                    |   | responses to be significant | | | |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other              | 1 |            |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                    |   |            |   |           |   |

```
Course-Section: PHYS 480  1                   University of Maryland                            Page 1198
Title        Tech In Theoretical Ph            Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Georganopoulos,                   Fall   2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
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  1  1  1  9  4.50  598/1509  4.50  4.36  4.31  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  356/1509  4.67  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  4.50  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  4.56  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  4.73  4.01  4.09  4.11  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0  1  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  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      1   0  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  3.00 ****/  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  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    11  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                      University of Maryland                          Page 1198
Title          Tech In Theoretical Ph              Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Georganopoulos,                       Fall   2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 12                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99    0       A    5        Required for Majors   7    Graduate     4      Major       8
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    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 significant
                                         I    0        Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 601  1              University of Maryland                          Page 1199
Title      Quantum Mechanics              Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Franson,James D              Fall  2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
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  0  1  6  4.50  598/1509  4.50  4.36  4.31  4.39  4.50
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  5  3  4.38  668/1287  4.38  4.19  4.30  4.22  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  0  4  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   1  0  1  0  4  2  4.00  813/1406  4.00  4.01  4.09  4.12  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  192/1489  4.75  4.22  4.17  4.14  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  642/1506  4.88  4.72  4.67  4.71  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  0  4  2  4.33  545/1463  4.33  4.03  4.09  4.15  4.33

             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  4  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  489/1236  4.25  4.08  4.00  3.98  4.25

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1260  ****  4.24  4.14  4.21  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1255  ****  4.59  4.33  4.43  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1258  ****  4.45  4.38  4.50  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 873  ****  4.19  4.03  4.01  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2      0.00-0.99    1      A   5      Required for Majors   7    Graduate      2      Major        5
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   2
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C   0      General               0    Under-grad    6      Non-major    3
  84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0      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                 0
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 602  1                        University of Maryland                                    Page 1200
Title        Statistical Mechanics                   Baltimore County                                        MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  McCann,Kevin J                          Fall   2009                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
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   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


           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  ****


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

  00-27      2        0.00-0.99    0         A    3          Required for Majors   8      Graduate     4       Major         5
  28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0         B    5                                       Under-grad   4
  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
                                             P    0                                        responses to be significant
                                             I    0          Other                 0
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 606  1                University of Maryland                                    Page 1201
Title         Classical Mechanics              Baltimore County                                    MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Worchesky,Terra                  Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      13
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   2   2   6  4.40   724/1509   4.40  4.36  4.31 4.39  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   5   3  4.10  1013/1509   4.10  4.16  4.26 4.25  4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   3   5  4.20   826/1287   4.20  4.19  4.30 4.22  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   3   2   4  4.11   902/1459   4.11  4.11  4.22 4.16  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   0   2   6   0  3.44  1213/1406   3.44  4.01  4.09 4.12  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0   1   1   2   4  4.13   734/1384   4.13  4.29  4.11 4.16  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   5   5  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   6   4  4.40  1166/1506   4.40  4.72  4.67 4.71  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0  0   2   6   0  3.75  1101/1463   3.75  4.03  4.09 4.15  3.75


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   3   6  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   1   8  4.89   588/1421   4.89  4.82  4.73 4.78  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 7  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/1236   ****  4.08  4.00 3.98  ****


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0   0   0   2   3  4.60   549/1258   4.60  4.45  4.38 4.50  4.60

                                        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      4     Major       8
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    3
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    1       C    0       General               0     Under-grad    6     Non-major   2
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49    1       D    0
  Grad.     4        3.50-4.00    1       F    0       Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 609  1                    University of Maryland                              Page 1202
Title        Modern Optics                      Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Shih,Yan-hua                       Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
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  0  1  1  4.50   598/1509  4.50  4.36  4.31  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings contribute 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 assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained             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 cancelled                   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 overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0  0  0  0  1  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  0  1  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  2  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  0  2  5.00     1/1411  5.00  4.19  4.31  4.33  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  1219/1236  2.00  4.08  4.00  3.98  2.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                   1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 873  5.00  4.19  4.03  4.01  5.00


                                         Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 621  1                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1203
Title        Atmos Physics I                     Baltimore County                                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Sparling,Lynn C                     Fall   2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  4                        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  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 learned 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 effectiveness 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
```

                             Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 631  1              University of Maryland                        Page 1204
Title          The Physics Of Astroph    Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Henriksen,Mark            Fall   2009                                   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   1   1   3  4.40   724/1509  4.40  4.36  4.31  4.39  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   3   1  4.25   770/1459  4.25  4.11  4.22  4.16  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   0   2   2  4.00   986/1489  4.00  4.22  4.17  4.14  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1506  5.00  4.72  4.67  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   1   3   0   1  3.20  1354/1463  3.20  4.03  4.09  4.15  3.20

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   3   1   1  3.60  1358/1438  3.60  4.52  4.46  4.49  3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1421  5.00  4.82  4.73  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   1   1   1   1  3.00  1361/1411  3.00  4.19  4.31  4.33  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   2   1   1  3.40  1294/1405  3.40  4.29  4.32  4.33  3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  0   0   0   1   1  4.50   274/1236  4.50  4.08  4.00  3.98  4.50

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 690  1                University of Maryland                          Page 1205
Title          Prof Skills Phys             Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Hayden,L M                   Fall   2009                                   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  3  8  4.73  339/1509  4.73 4.36  4.31 4.39  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   6  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  359/1287  4.67 4.19  4.30 4.22  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  141/1459  4.82 4.11  4.22 4.16  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  216/1489  4.73 4.22  4.17 4.14  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  965/1506  4.64 4.72  4.67 4.71  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  325/1463  4.50 4.03  4.09 4.15  4.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  209/1260  4.80 4.24  4.14 4.21  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  412/1255  4.70 4.59  4.33 4.43  4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1258  5.00 4.45  4.38 4.50  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   3  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   83/ 873  4.86 4.19  4.03 4.01  4.86

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1  1  0  0  1  0  8  4.78   41/  89  4.78 4.67  4.49 4.39  4.78
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 1 0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50   58/  92  4.50 4.50  4.54 4.52  4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   37/  90  4.70 4.70  4.50 4.48  4.70
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   19/  92  4.80 4.82  4.38 4.30  4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                1   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   18/  93  4.80 4.90  4.06 4.04  4.80

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PHYS 698  1                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1206
Title       Physics Seminar                    Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: McMillan,Willia                    Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
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   0   1   1   3   4  4.11 1032/1509  4.11 4.36 4.31 4.39 4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   1   5   2  4.13  992/1509  4.13 4.16 4.26 4.25 4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   3   1  4.25  779/1287  4.25 4.19 4.30 4.22 4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   1   0   1   1   4  4.00  979/1459  4.00 4.11 4.22 4.16 4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6   0   0   0   3   0  4.00  813/1406  4.00 4.01 4.09 4.12 4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   1   1   6  4.63  260/1384  4.63 4.29 4.11 4.16 4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   3   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  674/1489  4.33 4.22 4.17 4.14 4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78  820/1506  4.78 4.72 4.67 4.71 4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   2   3   2  4.00  853/1463  4.00 4.03 4.09 4.15 4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   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   7   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1421  **** 4.82 4.73 4.78 ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1411  **** 4.19 4.31 4.33 ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/1405  **** 4.29 4.32 4.33 ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1236  **** 4.08 4.00 3.98 ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1260  **** 4.24 4.14 4.21 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1255  **** 4.59 4.33 4.43 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1258  **** 4.45 4.38 4.50 ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 873  **** 4.19 4.03 4.01 ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant 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 available for individual 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 contribute to what you learned 2  5   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  90  **** 4.70 4.50 4.48 ****
4. Did presentations contribute 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 made clear                2   4   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/  93  5.00 4.90 4.06 4.04 5.00


                             Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99   0      A   3          Required for Majors   6      Graduate     4      Major        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
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49   0      D   0
 Grad.      4        3.50-4.00   1      F   0          Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   1                                       responses to be significant
                                        I   0          Other                 0
                                        ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: PHYS 707  1                   University of Maryland                            Page 1207
Title      Adv Electromagnetic Th             Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Kramer,Ivan                     Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7                    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  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

                             Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                                     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  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  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  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  0  0  3  5.00    1/1459    5.00 4.11  4.22 4.16  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  674/1489    4.33 4.22  4.17 4.14  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1506    5.00 4.72  4.67 4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  0  1  2  4.67  209/1463    4.67 4.03  4.09 4.15  4.67

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  3  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  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  0  2  5.00    1/1411    5.00 4.19  4.31 4.33  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   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 0 0 0 0  0  1  2  4.67  176/1236    4.67 4.08  4.00 3.98  4.67

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1260    5.00 4.24  4.14 4.21  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1255    5.00 4.59  4.33 4.43  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1258    5.00 4.45  4.38 4.50  5.00
```

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 1 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 1 | 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 | 3 |
| 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 | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |