IDEAS IN MODERN PHYSIC

Title

Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL Enrollment:

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

3

4

0

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

2

В

С

D

F

Ρ

I

12

0

0

0

0

0

1

Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1276 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Non-major 47

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

	1770	3.7.3		equer			-		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sec
Questions	NK	NA	1	2 	3 	4		Mean	Rank 	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	34	4.70	440/1670	4.70	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	41	4.85	216/1666	4.85	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.8
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	40	4.87	219/1406	4.87	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.8
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	141/1615	4.92	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	4	6	31	4.66	302/1566	4.66	3.81	4.07	4.03	4.
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	136/1528	4.88	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	2	7	35	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.
3. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	44	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.61	5.
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	11	26	4.66	286/1626	4.66	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	403/1559	4.82	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	44	4.98	179/1560	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	181/1549	4.91	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.
1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	42	4.91	231/1546	4.91	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	3	3	34	4.71	211/1323	4.71	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.
Discussion														
l. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	466/1384	4.48	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	556/1378	4.57	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	365/1378	4.83	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.
. Were special techniques successful	25	13	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	****/ 904	****	4.14	4.03	3.94	* *
Laboratory														
. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.59	4.21	4.35	* *
Seminar														
1. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	* *
Field Work														
. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	* *
. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.19	4.07	* 1
Self Paced														
. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 20	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	* *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	* *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	2.00	4.54	4.46	* *
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	s 2	4	 Graduat	 e	0	Majc		

General

Other

Electives

5

2

1

Under-grad 47

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title Basic Physics I

Instructor: Cui, Lili

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 46

84-150

Grad.

7

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 13

9

D

F

Ρ

I

1

0

0

0

4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 3
AUG 6, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Co	urse Evalu	ation Que	estionnaire
------------	------------	-----------	-------------

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	9	13	24	4.33	,		4.51	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	16	27	4.52			4.52	4.27	4.30	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	16	27	4.50			4.52	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	3	9	9	17		1055/1615		4.45	4.24	4.17	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	1	4	6	16	12		1039/1566		4.39	4.07	4.03	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	2	2	4	8	12		1011/1528		4.40	4.12	4.00	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	7	30	4.41			4.51	4.22	4.28	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	2	41	4.91	675/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	4	19	13	4.19	808/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	37	4.82	403/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	9	36	4.80	855/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	10	12	23	4.29	952/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	12	27	4.47	768/1546		4.51	4.32	4.32	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	7	12	23	4.27	529/1323		4.13	4.00	3.91	
	_	_	-	_	•				,					
Discussion	4.0	0	0	0	0	1	-1	2 75	**** /1204		4 62	4 10	2 00	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	2	1	1		****/1384		4.63	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	0	1	1	1		****/1378		4.75	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	0	0	2	1		****/1378		4.89	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	8	17	14	4.07	140/ 232	****	3.79	4.19	4.25	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	2	6	13	19	4.22	136/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.35	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	4	9	27	4.57	107/ 230	****	4.14	4.44	4.58	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	0	10	29	4.65	87/ 231	****	4.44	4.31	4.45	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	4	15	21	4.43	94/ 218	****	4.25	4.18	4.47	4.43
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	***
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 16	****	****	4 67	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make treat the expected goar	13	U	U	U		U	O	3.00	/ 10			4.07	1.03	
Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 16			 quire					9	 Graduat		0	 Majo		0
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 16 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 15			dutt (cu L	OT 1	10ر ما	b	,	Graduat	_	J	Ma JC	·±	U
56-83 10 2.00-2.99 3 C 6		Gor	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non	major	9
50-05 IU 2.00-2.99 5 C 0		Gel	пета.	_				_	onder -9	rau 4		MOII-	ma JUL	J

Electives

Other

0

32

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title Basic Physics II

Instructor: Cui, Lili

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 4
AUG 6, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	6	44	4.60	557/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	47	4.79	280/1666		4.52	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	10	42	4.65	447/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	6	12	24	4.30	825/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	5	13	10	24		1010/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	2	0	5	11	17	4.17	778/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	48	4.79	237/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	52	4.90	693/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	4	25	21	4.34	627/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	50	4.89	291/1559		4.65	4.46	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	6	47	4.82	829/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	45	4.78	323/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	9	45	4.80	345/1546		4.51	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	9	43	4.76	183/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.76
Discussion					_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	2	2		****/1384		4.63	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	54	0	0	0	0	2 1	2		****/1378		4.75	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	54 54	1	0	0	0	1	3 2		****/1378 ****/ 904		4.89 4.22	4.31	4.08 3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	54	Τ.	U	U	U	1	۷	4.07	/ 904		4.22	4.03	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	3	5	17	18	10	3.51			3.79	4.19	4.25	3.51
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	3	15	20	14	3.81	182/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.35	3.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	9	11	16	16	3.70	211/ 230		4.14	4.44	4.58	3.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	4	9	10	29	4.23	142/ 231	****	4.44	4.31	4.45	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	4	6	17	24	4.08	140/ 218	****	4.25	4.18	4.47	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		5.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75		4.97	4.57	4.46	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	57 57	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 79 ****/ 80		4.72 4.22	4.45 3.97	4.59 3.99	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 60		4.22	3.97	3.99	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.67	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38		****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38		****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39		****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	***	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28		****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101 Title

Basic Physics II

Cui, Lili Instructor:

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 4 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101 University of Maryland INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Page 1277 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment:	49				
Ouestionnaires:	26	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

								_		T		G	Damb	TIMDO	T 1	G = +
					Fre	eque		es ,	_		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	589/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.58
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	858/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.35
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	15	4.46	644/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.46
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the	expected goals	0	10	0	4	1	7	4	3.69	1368/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.69
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	o what you learned	1	2	0	3	4	6	10	4.00	851/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	1	9	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1380/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.31
7. Was the grading	system clearly exp	lained -	1	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	720/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		1	1	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	1022/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you gr	ade the overall te	aching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	751/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.77
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	809/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	855/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	8	13	4.31	936/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures	contribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	1	0	0	8	17	4.54	679/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.54
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	326/1323	4.21	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.50
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		o what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	7	9	3.72	1009/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.72
2. Were all student		_	1	0	1	0	6	8	10	4.04	954/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.04
3. Did the instruct	-		1	0	1	1	2	11	10	4.12	937/1378		4.13	4.31	4.08	4.12
4. Were special tec	_	and open arroadren	1	1	1	2	6	5	10	3.88	580/ 904		4.14	4.03		3.88
		Frequ	ienas	, Diet	-rih	ı+i 0	n									
		rrequ	rency	ומדמ	اللتت	uCIOI	1.1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101 University of Marylan
Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County
Instructor: DE SOUZA-MACHAD (Instr. B) Spring 2008

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

2

0

49

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

7

5

D

F

Ι

1

0

0

0

0

University of Maryland Page 1278
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

0

20

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Questionnaires:	26	Ctudont	Comman	Errolinotion	Questionnaire
Questionnaires.	20	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions Ray Frequency Ray Frequency Ray	~									~										
Questions									Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 16 4.58 589/1670 4.33 4.47 4.31 4.23 4.58 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 9 13 4.35 858/1666 4.26 4.26 4.34 4.27 4.30 4.35 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 4 1 7 4 3.69 1368/1615 3.90 4.21 4.24 4.17 3.69 15 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 3 4 6 10 4.00 851/1566 3.68 3.81 4.07 4.03 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1380/1528 3.47 4.00 4.12 4.00 3.31 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 720/1650 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 1 0 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1626 3.76 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.77 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1			Question	ıs			NR	NA		_			5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 9 13 4.35 858/1666 4.26 4.34 4.27 4.30 4.35 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 9 15 4.46 644/1406 4.33 4.40 4.32 4.31 4.46 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 4 1 7 4 3.69 1368/1615 3.90 4.21 4.24 4.17 3.69 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 3 4 6 10 4.00 851/1566 3.68 3.81 4.07 4.03 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1380/1528 3.47 4.00 4.12 4.00 3.31 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 720/1650 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 720/1650 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.67 1022/1667 4.69 4.83 4.67 4.61 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 1 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1626 3.76 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.77 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 25 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3 3.00 ****/1559 4.30 4.54 4.46 4.47 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1560 4.60 4.78 4.72 4.68 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1549 4.03 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.31 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/1540 4.19 4.37 4.32 4.31 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1			Genera	.1																
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 9 15 4.46 644/1406 4.33 4.40 4.32 4.31 4.46 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 4 1 7 4 3.69 1368/1615 3.90 4.21 4.24 4.17 3.69 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 3 4 6 10 4.00 851/1566 3.68 3.81 4.07 4.03 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1380/1528 3.47 4.00 4.12 4.03 3.13 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 720/1650 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 8 16 4.67 1022/1667 4.69 4.83 4.67 4.61 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 1 0 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1626 3.76 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.77 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 25 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1559 4.30 4.54 4.46 4.47 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/1560 4.60 4.78 4.72 4.68 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/1546 4.69 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.31 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1546 4.69 4.37 4.32 4.32 4.54 Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 4.04 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05	1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this cours	se	0	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	589/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 4 1 7 4 3.69 1368/1615 3.90 4.21 4.24 4.17 3.69 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 3 4 6 10 4.00 851/1566 3.68 3.81 4.07 4.03 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1388/1528 3.47 4.00 4.12 4.00 3.40 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1388/1528 3.47 4.00 4.12 4.00 3.40 7.00 4.00 8.00 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 720/1650 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1667 4.69 4.83 4.67 4.61 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 1 0 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1626 3.76 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.77 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	858/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 3 4 6 10 4.00 851/1566 3.68 3.81 4.07 4.03 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1380/1528 3.47 4.00 4.12 4.00 3.31 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goal	ls	0	0	0	1	1	9	15	4.46	644/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1380/1528 3.47 4.00 4.12 4.00 3.31 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 720/1650 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 8 16 4.67 1022/1667 4.69 4.83 4.67 4.61 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 1 0 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1626 3.76 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.77 Lecture Lecture	4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	3	0	10	0	4	1	7	4	3.69	1368/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 720/1650 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 8 16 4.67 1022/1667 4.69 4.83 4.67 4.61 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 1 0 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1626 3.76 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.77 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 25 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1559 4.30 4.54 4.46 4.47 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/1560 4.60 4.78 4.72 4.68 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/1540 4.03 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1546 4.19 4.37 4.32 4.32 4.54 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 4.04 Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 0 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4.04 Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1	5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you lea	arned	1	2	0	3	4	6	10	4.00	851/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 8 16 4.67 1022/1667 4.69 4.83 4.67 4.61 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 1 0 0 0 3 7 0 3.70 1289/1626 3.76 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.77 Lecture Lectu	6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ribute t	to what you l	learned	1	9	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1380/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.31
Lecture Lect	7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained		1	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	720/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.40
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 25 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/1559 4.30 4.54 4.46 4.47 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1549 4.03 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1546 4.19 4.37 4.32 4.32 4.54 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 100-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1	8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled			1	1	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	1022/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.67
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 25 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1559 4.30 4.54 4.46 4.47 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1560 4.60 4.78 4.72 4.68 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1549 4.03 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1546 4.19 4.37 4.32 4.32 4.54 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/ 904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 OO-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1	9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ill tead	ching effecti	iveness	15	1	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1289/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1560 4.60 4.78 4.72 4.68 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1549 4.03 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1546 4.19 4.37 4.32 4.32 4.54 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/ 904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 One of the instructor of the control																				
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 24 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1549 4.03 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1546 4.19 4.37 4.32 4.32 4.54 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/ 904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 One of the instructor of	1. Were th					25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.58	
## Discussion Discussion	2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subjec	ct	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.81
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/ 904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained cle	early	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.31
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3 4 7 9 3.72 1009/1384 3.95 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.72 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/ 904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 O0-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1	4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned		24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/ 904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 0-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1			Discus	sion																
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 6 8 10 4.04 954/1378 4.07 4.11 4.29 4.09 4.04 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 1 2 11 10 4.12 937/1378 4.05 4.13 4.31 4.08 4.12 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/ 904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 0-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1	1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you lea	arned	1	0	2	3	4	7	9	3.72	1009/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.72
4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 1 2 6 5 10 3.88 580/904 3.90 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.88 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1					_		1	0	1	0	6	8	10	4.04	954/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.04
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1			_	_	_	_	1	0	1	1	2	11	10	4.12	937/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.12
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1	4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	essful	_		1	1	1	2	6	5	10	3.88	580/ 904	3.90	4.14	4.03	3.94	3.88
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1						Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1	-				-															
·	Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA	\ - = = = = = = -	Expected	ted Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту 	pe 			Majors 	;
20 FF 6 1 00 1 00 0 P F					Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1			
	28-55																			
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 4 C 7 General 2 Under-grad 26 Non-major 25		3	2.00-2.99 4 C 7			Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	26	Non-	Non-major 25			

Electives

Other

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL (Instr. C) Spring 2008

Page 1279 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	49					
Questionnaires:	26	St	udent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

					equer		3			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	N	VR.	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	9	16	4.58	589/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	858/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	1	1	9	15	4.46	644/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		0	10	0	4	1	7	4	3.69	1368/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learn	ned	1	2	0	3	4	6	10	4.00	851/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lea	arned	1	9	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1380/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		1	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	720/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled		1	1	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	1022/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	eness 1	L6	2	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	1448/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	23	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear	rly 2	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	_ 2	24	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.54
•															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn	ned	1	0	2	3	4	7	9	3.72	1009/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participation	ate	1	0	1	0	6	8	10	4.04	954/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss		1	0	1	1	2	11	10	4.12	937/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful		1	1	1	2	6	5	10	3.88	580/ 904	3.90	4.14	4.03	3.94	3.88
1										,					
	Frequen	гсу	Dist	ribu	itior	1									
	-	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G	rades				Rea	son	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 9			Red	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	1
28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 5			-				,						3 -		
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 4 C 7			Gen	eral	_				2	Under-g	rad 2	6	Non-	major	25
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 7 D 1										5				3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0			Ele	ctiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

20

University of Maryland INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County

Enrollment:

53

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0102 Page 1280 Title AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A) Job IRBR3029

(Ouestionnaires:	20	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
١,	Juca CIOIIIIa II ca .	20	bludent	COULDE	Evaluation	Ouescronnarie

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1344/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1199/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	997/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1276/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	1	1	4	3	3.08	1465/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 1	9	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1351/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	1107/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	922/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	7	3	4	3.56	1361/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	1316/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	13		1205/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	5	4	7		1365/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	2	8		1354/1546		4.37	4.32	4.32	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	3	6	7	3.89			4.24	4.00	3.91	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	5	1	7	3 25	1200/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	2	1	4	8		1228/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	3	5	4	4		1302/1378		4.13	4.31	4.08	3.05
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	3	3	0	3	7	3.50	718/ 904		4.14	4.03		3.50
Proce		/ Dist	⊦ w i b		_									
rreg	[ueiic]	, DIS	CLID	uLIO	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 12 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 6														

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	ns Type			Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0102 Page 1281 AUG 6, 2008 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Spring 2008 Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL (Instr. C) Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	53	
Ouestionnaires:	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1344/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1199/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	997/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1276/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	1	1	4	3	3.08	1465/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1351/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	1107/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	922/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	5	1	7	3.25	1200/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	2	1	4	8	3.40	1228/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	3	5	4	4	3.05	1302/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	3.05
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	3	3	0	3	7	3.50	718/ 904	3.90	4.14	4.03	3.94	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Expected Grades Reasons Type					Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6			1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0103 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A) Spring 2008

Enrollment:

52

rsity of Maryland Page 1282 ltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

				Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		0	0	_	0	_	_	0	1 11	765 (1670	4 22	4 47	4 21	4 00	4 44
1. Did you gain new insights, skills fro		0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	765/1670		4.47	4.31	4.23	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	Ţ	7	8	4.44	735/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the e		0	0	0	Τ.	3	7	5		1057/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the ex		0	8	0	0	3	4	1		1325/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to	-	0	4	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	994/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute t	-	0	5	1	2	2	4	2		1351/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	8	5		1055/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	922/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teac	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	831/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.99	
T															
Lecture	1	_	0	•	0	0		_	4 56	001/1550	4 20	4 = 4	4 46	4 45	4 56
1. Were the instructor's lectures well		0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	821/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested i	•	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	673/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and e		0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	924/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	879/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	692/1323	4.21	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to	what you learned	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	4	5	7	4.19	721/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.19
2. Were all students actively encourage	-	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	603/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.50
		0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	615/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful			1	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	429/ 904		4.14	4.03	3.94	4.13
1. NOTO SPOOTAL COMMITTAGES SUCCESSIVE			_	-	-	-	•	_		.,					
Frequ			Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0103 University of Maryla Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: DE SOUZA-MACHAD (Instr. B) Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1283
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	52		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionn	aire

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	765/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	735/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1057/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1325/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	994/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1351/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1055/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	922/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1347/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	4.21	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	721/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	8	8		603/1378		4.11	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	1	5	10		615/1378		4.13	4.31	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful		1	0	0	3	7		4.13	429/ 904				3.94	
Frequ			trib	utio	n									
Guidita Francia Gui GDA - Francia Guide	1								_				No	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0103 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL (Instr. C) Spring 2008

niversity of Maryland Page 1284
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	52		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	Λ	0	2	5	g	4.44	765/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	735/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	5		1057/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	4	1		1325/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	994/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	4	2		1351/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	5		1055/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	922/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	797/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1560		4.78	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1549		4.33	4.31	4.32	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546		4.37	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/1323		4.24	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	721/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	603/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	615/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	429/ 904		4.14	4.03	3.94	4.13
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0104 University of Maryla:
Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County
Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A) Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1285
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	52	
Questionnaires:	21	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1194/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	1142/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	632/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	813/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1341/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	1	7	5	3.87	1072/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	7	8	3.95	1206/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	1032/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	728/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	755/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	1102/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3		10	4.33	900/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	987/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	612/1323	4.21	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	519/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	935/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	850/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	451/ 904	3.90	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.06
Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				2	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0104 INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

University of Maryland Page 1286 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title CORBITT, PAUL (Instr. C) Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment:	52					
Ouestionnaires:	21		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1194/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	1142/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	632/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	813/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1341/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	1	7	5	3.87	1072/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	7	8	3.95	1206/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	1032/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	4.21	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	519/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	935/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	850/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	451/ 904	3.90	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.06
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0105 University of Maryland INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County Title Spring 2008

Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

Page 1287

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							L L	eque.	пстер	>		TIID	LIUCCOL	Course	Debr	UMBC	пелет	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	870/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	851/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	760/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	208/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.83
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1310/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.33
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	l teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.60
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.83
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560			4.72		5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	488/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.67
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	520/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	423/1323	4.21	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.40
		Discuss	d on															
1 Did al.	aga diga			what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	_	4.33	608/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.33
				d to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1		4.33			4.11	4.29	4.09	4.33
		_	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	2	0	0		4.00	977/1378		4.13	4.31		4.00
		echniques succes		d Open discussion	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	461/ 904			4.03		4.00
T. WELE S	peciai ce	sciniiques succes	ssiui		U	2	U	U	2	U	2	4.00	401/ 504	3.90	4.14	4.03	3.74	4.00
				Frequ	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 3					or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		Ke	quit	eu I	OI MC	יוס רי	5	U	Graduat	C	U	мал	JI	Τ.
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GC	iici a	_				U	onder -g	Luu	J	NOIL	ilia JOI	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E.1	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	t enouc	ıh
JI uu.	Ü	3.30 1.00	_	P 0								•	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+	her					5	1 COPOID					
				± 0		JU						_						

? 0

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0106 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1288

Enrollment:	50				
Questionnaires:	25	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	1	10	11	4.17	1094/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	967/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	715/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1306/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	1	2	10	4	3.55	1257/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	2	4	5	2	3.20	1413/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	705/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	873/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	0	10	8	4.20	797/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	821/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	1090/1560	4.60	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	8	11	4.25	977/1549	4.03	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	987/1546	4.19	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	514/1323	4.21	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	8	8	3.96	876/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	970/1378	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	8	5	9	3.96	1016/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	624/ 904	3.90	4.14	4.03	3.94	3.76
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	:

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Ex		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	=			
				n	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0106 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL (Instr. C)

Enrollment:

50

University of Maryland Page 1289 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

(Ouestionnaires:	25	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
١,	Juco CIUIIIaii co .	23	bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Jucacionnatic

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	1	10	11	4.17	1094/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	967/1666	4.26	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	715/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1306/1615	3.90	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	1	2	10	4	3.55	1257/1566	3.68	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	2	4	5	2	3.20	1413/1528	3.47	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	705/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	873/1667	4.69	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1626	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1559	4.30	4.54	4.46	4.47	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	2	1	1		****/1560		4.78	4.72	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1549		4.33	4.31	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0			****/1546				4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	2	0	1	1	0			****/1323				3.91	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	8	8	3.96	876/1384	3.95	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2		0	2	5	7	9	4.00	,	4.07	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2		0	1	8	5			1016/1378	4.05	4.13	4.31	4.08	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	3	4	5			624/ 904					3.76
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Chadita Bonned Chim CDA Francisco Chadina				De					m	.			Mo do	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке:	ason	ເຮ			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101 University of Maryland INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County

Title Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 35 Spring 2008

Questionnaires: 23 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	Questionnaires:	23	Student Course	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---	-----------------	----	----------------	--------------	---------------

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		om this source	0	0	0	1	2	0	12	4 2E	889/1670	1 11	1 17	1 21	4.23	4 2E
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	735/1666		4.34	4.27	4.23	
3. Did the exam ques		_	0	0	0	0	1	11			,		4.40	4.32	4.31	4.43
4. Did other evaluat	0	11	0	0	3	T.T	6			4.09	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.25		
5. Did assigned read			0	4	0	4	2	2	4	1.20	1303/1566		3.81	4.24	4.17	3.47
6. Did written assign	3	-	0	13	0	1	3	6	0		1274/1528			4.12	4.03	
7. Was the grading s		-	0	13	0	0	2	-	-	4.61				4.22	4.28	4.61
8. How many times wa	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	- ,		4.83	4.67	4.20			
9. How would you gra	2	1	0	0	2	10	7	4.20			4.06		4.01			
9. HOW WOULD YOU GIA	de the Overail tea	ching effectiveness	2		U	U	3	10	,	4.20	797/1020	4.00	4.00	4.11	4.07	3.94
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	689/1559	4.53	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.65		
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	699/1560	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.87
3. Was lecture mater		_	1	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	924/1549	4.17	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	643/1546	4.36	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	1	0	8	6	8	3.87	849/1323	3.99	4.24	4.00	3.91	3.87
	_,															
1 5 1 1 1	Discussion		0	0	0	•	_	_	_	2 65	1005/1004	2 62	4 01	4 10	2 00	2 65
1. Did class discuss		-	0	0	0 3	2	9 7	7			1037/1384			4.10		
2. Were all students			0	-	-	-					1263/1378			4.29	4.09	3.26
3. Did the instructo	_	nd open discussion	0	0 3	3 2		5	11			1291/1378			4.31	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful					2	2	6	4	6	3.50	718/ 904	3.78	4.14	4.03	3.94	3.50
Frequ				Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	
Expected Grades																

Page 1290

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27 28-55	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	. — А В	4 10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150 Grad.	3 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	6 4	D F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	2
Grad.	O	3.30-4.00	-	P	0	FIECTIVES	U	responses to		_	.1
				I	0	Other	20				

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101 University of Maryland INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County Instructor: WU, TIANPENG (Instr. B)

Title

Enrollment:

35

Page 1291 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	23	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnaires.	43	Student Course	Evaluation	guestionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	889/1670	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	735/1666	4.42	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	679/1406	4.45	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	874/1615		4.21	4.24	4.17	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	6	5	4	3.47	1303/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	1274/1528	3.70	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	429/1650	4.61	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	885/1667	4.79	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1329/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1559	4.53	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1560	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1549	4.17	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1546	4.36	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1323	3.99	4.24	4.00	3.91	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	9	7	5	3.65	1037/1384	3.63	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	3	7	5	5	3.26	1263/1378	3.41	4.11	4.29	4.09	3.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	3	5	11	1	3.17	1291/1378	3.37	4.13	4.31	4.08	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	2	2	6	4	6	3.50	718/ 904	3.78	4.14	4.03	3.94	3.50
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	dits Earned Cum. GPA Ex		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Instructor: ANDE Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 18 Spring 2008

Page 1292 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_			Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	544/1670	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	622/1666	4.42	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	667/1406	4.45	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1083/1615	4.09	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	3	4	3.29	1393/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1113/1528	3.70	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	417/1650	4.61	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	805/1667	4.79	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	486/1559	4.53	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	911/1560	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	549/1549	4.17	4.33		4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2		4.67	520/1546	4.36	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	670/1323	3.99	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.07
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	J	_	U	2	U	O	4.07	070/1323	3.99	1,21	4.00	3.91	1.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	6	4		1041/1384	3.63	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	4	1	3	3		1342/1378	3.41	4.11	4.29	4.09	2.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	5	3	3	2		1342/1378	3.37	4.13	4.31	4.08	2.65
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	425/ 904	3.78	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.58	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.59	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 230	****	4.74	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	4.69	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 218	****	4.38	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	E 00	1 60	1 67	****
 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Was the instructor available for individual attention 	17 17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00 ***	4.65 4.64	4.67 4.72	****
	17	0	0	0		-	0		****/ 75	****	****			****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	17 17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.45 3.97	4.59 3.99	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1/	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 60			3.97	3.99	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.19	4.07	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.42	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	2.00	4.67	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	∠.UU ****	4.84	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	-		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.75	****
J. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	Τ,	U	U	U	_	U	U	5.00	, 0			1.94	1.03	

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1292 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

PHYS 122 0102

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Instructor: WU, TIANPENG (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 18

,

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1293 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	544/1670		4.47	4.31	4.23	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	622/1666	4.42	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44		4.45	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	3	3	6		1083/1615	4.09	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	3	4		1393/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	2	5		1113/1528	3.70	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0			4.61	417/1650	4.61	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.83	805/1667		4.83	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1280/1559	4.53	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1467/1560	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1443/1549	4.17	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1329/1546	4.36	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	3.99	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1041/1384	3.63	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	4	1	3	3		1342/1378	3.41	4.11	4.29	4.09	2.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	5	3	3	2	2.65	1342/1378	3.37	4.13	4.31	4.08	2.65
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	425/ 904	3.78	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.14
T -bassakassa														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 232	****	4.58	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.59	4.19	4.25	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 230	****	4.74	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	4.69	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 218	****	4.38	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	U	Τ	0	Ü	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	2.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 6	****		4.92	4.83	****
÷									, -					

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: WU, TIANPENG (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1293 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Title Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1294 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Overtions				Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	974/1670	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.27
	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	895/1666		4.34	4.27	4.30	4.32
		estions reflec			1	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	556/1406	4.45	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.55
4. Did other	r evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	9	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	813/1615	4.09	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assi	gned re	adings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	2	3	0	4	5	8	3.75	1144/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.75
6. Did writ	en ass	ignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	10	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1025/1528	3.70	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.92
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	443/1650	4.61	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.59
8. How many	times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1002/1667	4.79	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.68
9. How would	d you g	rade the overa	ill tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	670/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.07	3.94
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	784/1559	4.53	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.59
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	829/1560	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.74
3. Was lect	ire mat	erial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	924/1549	4.17	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.16
4. Did the	lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	782/1546	4.36	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audi	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		your understanding	2	3	1	1	5	3	8	3.89	834/1323	3.99	4.24	4.00	3.91	3.89	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did clas	s discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	7	9	4	3.64	1045/1384	3.63	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.64
				ed to participate	1	0	1	4	1	7	9		1071/1378		4.11	4.29	4.09	3.86
				nd open discussion	2	0	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	1105/1378	3.37	4.13	4.31	4.08	3.76
4. Were spe	cial te	chniques succe	essful	-	1	3	1	4	4	5	5	3.47	730/ 904	3.78	4.14	4.03	3.94	3.47
		Labora	itory															
2. Were you	provid		_	ground information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	4.59	4.21	4.35	****
		Field	Work															
1 Did fiel	davner			what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	****
	_			luation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 38		3.00	4.19	4.07	****
z. Dia you	Jiearry	understand yo	our eval	ruacion criceria	22	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 30		3.00	4.10	1.07	
1 Did golf	naged	Self		what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
i. Did sell	-paceu	system contrib	die to	what you rearned	22	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 20		5.00	4.04	4.39	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	 0.00-0.99	0	 A 7			 miir		or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	 Majo		1
28-55	1-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 1-83 6 2.00-2.99 1 C 1		Kec	1u T t	a I	JI Ma	ייטני	D	_	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	,_				
56-83			Cer	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	23	Non-	-major	22			
84-150				001	.c.a.	-				J	onder -9	144 2		14011	,	22		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00		re not	enous	ah												
	•		-	P 0									respons				_	-
Graa.				1 0									TCDPOILD	CD CO X				
Grad.				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.9	respons	CD CO L	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0103 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
Instructor: GREENE, MARION (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 52 Ouestionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1295

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 5 6 11 4.27 974/1670 4.44 4.47 4.31 4.23 4.27 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 8 11 4.32 895/1666 4.42 4.34 4.27 4.30 4.32 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 1 5 15 4.55 556/1406 4.45 4.40 4.32 4.31 4.55 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 9 0 1 2 2 8 4.31 813/1615 4.09 4.21 4.24 4.17 4.31 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 3 0 4 5 8 3.75 1144/1566 3.44 3.81 4.07 4.03 3.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 1 1 2 2 6 3.92 1025/1528 3.70 4.00 4.12 4.00 3.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 3 3 16 4.59 443/1650 4.61 4.37 4.22 4.28 4.59 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 5 16 4.68 1002/1667 4.79 4.83 4.67 4.61 4.68 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 3 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 ****/1626 4.00 4.06 4.11 4.07 3.94 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 20 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 ****/1559 4.53 4.54 4.46 4.47 4.59 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1560 4.65 4.78 4.72 4.68 4.74 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 21 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1549 4.17 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.16 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1546 4.36 4.37 4.32 4.32 4.45 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 20 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1323 3.99 4.24 4.00 3.91 3.89 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 7 9 4 3.64 1045/1384 3.63 4.01 4.10 3.92 3.64 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 4 1 7 9 3.86 1071/1378 3.41 4.11 4.29 4.09 3.86 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 2 1 4 7 7 3.76 1105/1378 3.37 4.13 4.31 4.08 3.76 4. Were special techniques successful 1 3 1 4 4 5 5 3.47 730/904 3.78 4.14 4.03 3.94 3.47 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 239 **** 4.59 4.21 4.35 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 38 **** 3.00 4.19 4.07 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.64 4.59 **** Frequency Distribution Reasons Type Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors

 00-27
 0
 0.00-0.99
 0
 A
 7

 28-55
 6
 1.00-1.99
 0
 B
 9

 56-83
 6
 2.00-2.99
 1
 C
 1

 84-150
 1
 3.00-3.49
 6
 D
 0

 Grad.
 0
 3.50-4.00
 9
 F
 0

 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 1 General 0 Under-grad 23 Non-major 22 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 19

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0104 University of Maryland INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County

Title Spring 2008 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)

Enrollment:	51				-	
Questionnaires:	22		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
					_	,

	1				Ins	tructor			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	4	15	4.55	621/1670	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	784/1666	4.42	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	763/1406	4.45	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1288/1615	4.09	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	4	4	5	3.26	1402/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1257/1528	3.70	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	395/1650	4.61	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	768/1667	4.79	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	659/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	722/1559	4.53	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	911/1560	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	749/1549	4.17	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	6	14	4.45	782/1546	4.36	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	634/1323	3.99	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	8	6	3.59	1061/1384	3.63	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	3	4	7	8	3.91	1057/1378	3.41	4.11	4.29	4.09	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	9	3	9	3.91	1055/1378	3.37	4.13	4.31	4.08	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	5	6	8	4.00	461/ 904	3.78	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.58	4.19	4.25	****
To a con-		- D-2	2 1											

Page 1296 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	=			
				2	1						

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0104 University of Maryland Page 1297 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: WU, TIANPENG (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 51 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

DITT OT TIMETIC .	31	
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

South Course Ivaluation Questioninality														
			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	621/1670	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	784/1666	4.42	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	763/1406	4.45	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1288/1615	4.09	4.21	4.24	4.17	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	4	4	5	3.26	1402/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	d 0	11	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1257/1528	3.70	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	395/1650	4.61	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	768/1667	4.79	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 7	1	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1172/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1559	4.53	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	4.17	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	4.36	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	3.99	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	8	6	3.59	1061/1384	3.63	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	3	4	7	8	3.91	1057/1378	3.41	4.11	4.29	4.09	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	9	3	9	3.91	1055/1378	3.37	4.13	4.31	4.08	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	5	6	8	4.00	461/ 904	3.78	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.58	4.19	4.25	****
Fre	quency	/ Di	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 122H 0101 University of Maryland INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County

Page 1298 AUG 6, 2008 Title Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 11 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

FILL OI TIMETIC .	T T			
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncies	5		Ins	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	401/1670	4.73	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	556/1406	4.55	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1322/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1097/1528	3.83	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	222/1650	4.82	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1052/1667	4.64	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	637/1626	4.42	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	572/1559	4.86	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560	4.91	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	410/1549	4.86	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	333/1546	4.91	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	545/1323	4.25	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	431/1378	4.73	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	270/ 904	4.44	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.44
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту:	pe 			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PHYS 122H 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Instructor:

Page 1299 AUG 6, 2008 WORCHESKY, TERR (Instr. B) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	ollme		11			
_						

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Genera:	 L																
1. Did you	gain new	v insights,ski	lls from	n this cours	se	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	401/1670	4.73	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.73
2. Did the	instruct	or make clear	the exp	ected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Did the	exam que	estions reflect	the ex	spected goal	s	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	556/1406	4.55	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.55
4. Did othe	er evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	5	0	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assi	igned rea	adings contrib	ate to v	what you lea	arned	0	2	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1322/1566	3.44	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.44
6. Did writ	ten assi	ignments contr	ibute to	what you l	earned	0	5	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1097/1528	3.83	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y explai	ned		0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	222/1650	4.82	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.82
-		was class cance				0	0	0	0	0	4	7		1052/1667		4.83	4.67		
9. How woul	ld you gi	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effecti	veness	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.42	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.42
1 Nava +ha	inatan	Lecture stor's lectures		manarad		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	1/1559	4.86	1 51	1 16	4.47	4.86
		tor's lectures for seem intere	_	_	· +	8 8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00			4.54			
		erial presente		8	0	0	0	0	0	3			4.86			4.32			
		arry	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549		4.37						
			contribute to what you learned echniques enhance your understand						0	0	0	2		****/1323					
J. Did addi	LOVISUAI	ceciniiques em	lance yo	our underste	inding	8	1	0	U	U	U	2	3.00	/1323	1.23	1.21	1.00	3.71	1.23
		Discus	sion																
1. Did clas	ss discus	ssions contrib	ite to v	what you lea	rned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.01	4.10	3.92	4.55
2. Were all	l student	s actively end	courage	d to partici	pate	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	431/1378	4.73	4.11	4.29	4.09	4.73
3. Did the	instruct	or encourage	fair and	d open discu	ssion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.13	4.31	4.08	4.82
4. Were spe	ecial ted	chniques succes	ssful			0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	270/ 904	4.44	4.14	4.03	3.94	4.44
					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	asons	3			Typ	e			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	4														
56-83								nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad 1	.1	Non-	major	4
84-150															_				
Grad.	ad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0							ecti	ves				0	#### - M				_	h
		•							_		response	s to b	e sign	ıfıcan	ıt				
				I	0		Ot:	her				1	1						
	? 0																		

INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

GOUGOUSI, THEOD 15 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1300 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	835/1670	4.32	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	516/1666		4.34	4.27	4.30	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.40	4.32	4.31	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	712/1615	4.44	4.21	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.82	3.81	4.07	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	476/1528	4.23	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	263/1650	4.72	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	797/1626	4.24	4.06	4.11	4.07	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.67	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	622/1549	4.61	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	655/1546	4.28	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	326/1323	4.18	4.24	4.00	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.01	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/1378		4.11	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1378	****	4.13	4.31	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	3	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	107/ 232	4.32	4.58	4.19	4.25	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	68/ 239		4.50	4.19	4.25	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	114/ 230		4.74	4.44	4.58	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	108/ 231	4.54	4.69	4.31	4.45	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	60/ 218	4.49	4.38	4.18	4.47	4.62
J. Here regarrements for tab reports creatry specified	J	J	J	U	_	J	,	1.02	00/ 210	1.19	1.50	1.10	1.1/	1.02

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-	_		
					1						

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0102 University of Maryland Page 1301 INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD Spring 2008

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					LT.	=quei	TCTE	>		TIID	LIUCLOI	Course	: Debr	ONIDC	телет	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	996/1670	4.32	4.47	4.31	4.23	4.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	312/1666			4.27		4.75
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	7		552/1615				4.17	
				what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	752/1566					4.14
				o what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	6	4.00		4.23		4.12	4.00	4.00
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	361/1650	4.72	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.67
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667			4.67		5.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27			4.06	4.11	4.07	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were tl	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	971/1559	4.67	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.44
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	1	1			1090/1560		4.78		4.68	
				xplained clearly		0	0	0	1	1			488/1549				4.32	4.67
	the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1139/1546	4.28	4.37	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	our understanding	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	857/1323	4.18	4.24	4.00	3.91	3.86		
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	-	f the material	1	2	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	102/ 232	4.32	4.58	4.19	4.25	4.33
			_	ground information		0		0	0	2		4.45	98/ 239	4.53		4.21		4.45
_	_	_		or lab activities		0						4.82			4.74		4.58	
		structor provid			1	0	1	0	0	1		4.55	106/ 231			4.31	4.45	4.55
		_		early specified	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	103/ 218		4.38		4.47	4.36
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	tribı	ıtioı	n									
				1														
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	A 9		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	4	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	or	5		
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.							ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enoug	јh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt			
			I 0		Ot	her					7	_						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PHYS 220 0101 University of Maryland Page 1302 Title INTRO COMPUTATIONAL PH Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1 Did you	anin no	w insights,ski	_	m thia acur	90	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.78
		tor make clear				0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.78	415/1666	4.78	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.78
		ations reflect	_			0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1615	4.88	4.21	4.24	4.29	4.88
		ignments contr				0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.75
		system clearl			rearmed	0	1	0	0	1	5	2		1055/1650	4.13	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.13
		was class canc		IIIeu		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00		4.67	4.64	
	-	rade the overa		hing effect:	ivenecc	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67				4.11	4.06	
J. HOW WOU	ia you gi	rade the overa	II CEACI	ning errect.	rveness	U	U	U	U	U	J	O	1.07	270/1020	1.07	1.00	4.11	1.00	1.07
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.54	4.46	4.40	4.78
2. Did the	instruct	tor seem inter	ested in	n the subjec	ct	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	911/1560	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.78
3. Was lec	ture mate	erial presente	d and ex	xplained cle	early	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the	lectures	s contribute t	o what	you learned		0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.37	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did aud	iovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understa	anding	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1323	4.89	4.24	4.00	4.08	4.89
		_ ,																	
1 5 1 1		Discus			,	_	0	•	_	0	-	_	4 60	204/1204	4 60	4 01	4 10	4 0 11	4 60
		ssions contrib				6	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	- ,			4.10		
		ts actively en				6	0	0	0	1	0		4.33	. ,	4.33		4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the	instruct	tor encourage	iair and	a open alsci	ussion	6	U	U	U	U	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.13	4.31	4.26	4.6/
					Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	rnod	Cum. GPA		Expected	Crados				Por	asons				Ф. г.	20			Majors	
		Cuill. GPA		Expected	Grades					350115	· - – – – -			Ту]				Ma JOIS	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P	0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I	0		Oth	ner					9						
				?	0														

Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

MARTINS, JOSE

Instructor: Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1303

					Fr	eque:	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	aain na	Genera w insights,skil	=	thia annaa	0	0	0	0	0	_	4	4.44	751/1670	4.44	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.44
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	5 5	2		1199/1666	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.32	4.44
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33			4.40	4.32	4.39	4.33
	_	ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.33		4.33	4.40	4.24	4.29	4.33
			_	hat you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	4.25		4.25	3.81	4.24	4.29	4.36
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.25		4.25	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.25
		signments contr. s system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	3		4.44	,	4.44	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.67
		was class cance		illed	0	0	0	0	0	1	Ω		712/1667		4.83	4.67		4.89
	_			ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	3	2		1240/1626			4.11		3.78
J. HOW WO	uiu you g	rade the overa.	LI CEACI	ing effectiveness	U	U	U	U	-	J	2	3.70	1240/1020	3.70	1.00	7.11	1.00	3.70
		Lecture	2															
1. Were ti	he instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	971/1559	4.44	4.54	4.46	4.40	4.44
		tor seem inter	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	3	6		1090/1560	4.67	4.78	4.72	4.73	4.67
	lecture material presented and explained cle					0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33		4.33	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.33
	the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	5	3		1009/1546	4.22	4.37	4.32	4.30	4.22
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understar					1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63				4.00	4.08	4.63
		1	2										,					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to v	what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.01	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	****	4.11	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	air and	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	****	4.13	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.14	4.03	4.01	****
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ty	pe			Majors	
														- 				
00-27	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.							ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	rh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt			
				I 0		Ot	her					6						
				? 1														

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: PHYS 305 0101

6

STELLAR ASTROPHYSICS

HENRIKSEN, MARK

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1304

Ctudent	COURGA	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.40
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.60
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.60
	_	ations reflect			0	2	0	0	2	0	1		1380/1615	3.67	4.21	4.24	4.18	3.67
			_	hat you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566		3.81	4.07	4.04	4.50
				what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	****	4.00	4.12	4.07	****
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.40
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	4.40	4.06	4.11	4.06	4.40
				_														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.54	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested ir	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.37	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.24	4.00	3.99	4.00
		Discus																
				hat you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1384			4.10	4.12	****
				l to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378	****	4.11	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.13	4.31	4.33	****
				Frequ	onar	. Diat	-rih	u+i o	^									
				rrequ	lency	DIS	LLID	ucio.	11									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	muir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			1			. ,		-		_	-	5 -	_	_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2	-					
				? 1														

Course-Section: PHYS 315 0101 University of Maryland Page 1305 Title GALAXIES & INTERSTELLA Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2008

Instructor: TURNER, JANE

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

				_	ncie		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	-5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1430/1670	3.78	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1331/1666	3.89	4.34	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1142/1406	3.89	4.40	4.32	4.22	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.21	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	0	2.78	1526/1566	2.78	3.81	4.07	4.04	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1413/1528	3.20	4.00	4.12	4.07	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1335/1626	3.63	4.06	4.11	4.06	3.63
Lecture			_		_	_	_		054 /4550					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	5	4.44	/			4.46	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	Ι	8	4.89	647/1560		4.78	4.72	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0 2	5	3		1095/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	∠ 1	3			1009/1546 908/1323		4.37			4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	U	1	U	1	5	2	3.78	908/1323	3.78	4.24	4.00	3.99	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.01	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378		4.11	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	***	4.13	4.31	4.33	****
-														
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Per			 or M:	ajors		0	 Graduat		0	Majc		4
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2		1000	Jurr,	su I	OI M	JOIS		U	Graduat	C	U	Maje	·T	-
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 4		Ger	nerai	1				4	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	5
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 4 D 0		GEI	лста.	-				1	onder -9	Luu	,	INOII-	ilia joi	J
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		E14	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
P 0		111						Ü	respons				_	
I O		Otl	ner					5					-	

Course-Section: PHYS 321 0101 University of Maryland Page 1306 Title INTERMEDIATE MECHANICS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA

Enrollment: 23 Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	1	1	3	3.00	1620/1670	3.00	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	1	0	1	2.00	1661/1666	2.00	4.34	4.27	4.18	2.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	2	1	1	2.60	1394/1406	2.60	4.40	4.32	4.22	2.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.21	4.24	4.18	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.81	4.07	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1345/1528	3.38	4.00	4.12	4.07	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	2	0	1	1	2.13	1636/1650	2.13	4.37	4.22	4.12	2.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	0	3	0	1	2.25	1608/1626	2.25	4.06	4.11	4.06	2.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	1	2	3.30	1492/1559	3.30	4.54	4.46	4.40	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1398/1560	4.30	4.78	4.72	4.67	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	1	2	0	1	1.90	1543/1549	1.90	4.33	4.31	4.25	1.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	2	0	1	2.20	1529/1546	2.20	4.37	4.32	4.24	2.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.24	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1352/1384	2.33	4.01	4.10	4.12	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1139/1378	3.67	4.11	4.29	4.30	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1255/1378	3.33	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.14	4.03	4.03	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons					Туре				Majors			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Re	anir	ed f	 or Ma	aior:		0	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	 r	7

Credits Ea	arned	rned Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Type	Type		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	
04 150	_	2 00 2 40	2	D 0						

3

84-150 3.00-3.49 Grad. 3.50-4.00 F 0 Electives #### - Means there are not enough Ρ 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 10 4

Course-Section: PHYS 324 0101

12

MODERN PHYSICS RENO, ROBERT C

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1307

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

~						~										
					Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	0 0	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the	expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.21	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1566	4.67	3.81	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.00	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.75
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.06	4.11	4.06	4.67
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.54	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.37	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.75	4.24	4.00	3.99	4.75
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	o what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.01	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all student	s actively encourage	ged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special tec	hniques successful		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.14	4.03	4.03	5.00
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incr	ease understanding	of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.58	4.19	4.04	5.00
2. Were you provide	d with adequate ba	ckground information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	4.59	4.21	3.99	5.00
3. Were necessary m	aterials available	for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	4.74	4.44	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lab inst	ructor provide ass	istance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.11	5.00
5. Were requirement	s for lab reports	clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	4.38	4.18	3.93	5.00
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	S			Tv	pe			Majors	5

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

Course-Section: PHYS 324H 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County MODERN PHYSICS HONORS

0

P I 0

? 0

Title Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 6 Spring 2008 Page 1308

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

BIII OI IIICIIC •	0			
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Quescionna	illes.	O		Student Cot	irse	Eval	uati	JII QU	iest.	LOIIIIG	ITTE							
							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.83
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.21	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1440/1566	3.17	3.81	4.07	4.04	3.17
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.75
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How man	y times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.79	4.06	4.11	4.06	4.79
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.54	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was led	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.50	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	4.83	4.37	4.32	4.24	4.83
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	590/1323	4.10	4.24	4.00	3.99	4.10
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	64/ 232	4.60	4.58	4.19	4.04	4.60
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequa	te bacl	ground information	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 239	4.80	4.59	4.21	3.99	4.80
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avai	lable i	for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	63/ 230	4.80	4.74	4.44	4.25	4.80
4. Did the	lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	stance	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.11	5.00
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	32/ 218	4.80	4.38	4.18	3.93	4.80
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ıtior	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
		0 00 0 00									. – – –							
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 2 B 3		ке	quire	eu fo	or Ma	ijors	ó	0	Graduat	E	0	Majo)T	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh

Other

6

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PHYS 324H 0101 Page 1309 Title MODERN PHYSICS HONORS AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C (Instr. B) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6			
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire	

							_							~			- 1	a .
		Ouestion			MD	3.7.7	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	S 1	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	1S		NK	NA				-4 	5 	Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	al															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.83
3. Did the	e exam qı	estions reflec	ct the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did otl	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.21	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1440/1566	3.17	3.81	4.07	4.04	3.17
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.75
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.79	4.06	4.11	4.06	4.79
		Lectur	~e															
1 Were tl	he instri	actor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.83	4.54	4.46	4.40	4.83
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.67	5.00
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	1		900/1549	4.50	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.50
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	0	1	2		520/1546	4.83	4.37	4.32	4.24	4.83
				your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	692/1323		4.24	4.00	3.99	4.10
		_																
		Labora	-			_	_			_								
			_	of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	64/ 232	4.60	4.58	4.19	4.04	4.60
				kground information	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 239	4.80	4.59	4.21	3.99	4.80
	_			for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	63/ 230	4.80	4.74	4.44	4.25	4.80
		structor provid			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.11	5.00
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	ports c	learly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	32/ 218	4.80	4.38	4.18	3.93	4.80
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GP <i>I</i>		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	2

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

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101

MODERN PHYSICS LAB

Title

Instructor: WU, EN-SHINN Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1310 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		665/1670	4.50			4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0		1603/1666	3.00	4.34	4.27	4.18	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.21	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.81	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1491/1626	3.25	4.06	4.11	4.06	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	1280/1559	4.00	1 E1	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2		1090/1560	4.67	4.78	4.72	4.40	4.67
		-			0		_		,					
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1		2			1443/1549	3.33	4.33		4.25	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	0		1473/1546	3.00	4.37		4.24	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	4.24	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904		4.14			5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 232	4.67	4.58	4.19	4.04	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	191/ 239	3.75	4.59	4.21	3.99	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	165/ 230	4.25	4.74	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	190/ 231	3.75	4.69	4.31	4.11	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	212/ 218	2.50	4.38	4.18	3.93	2.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	E 00	1 65	1 20	E 00
i. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 0/	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.30	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.44	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	33/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.96	3.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.27	4.38	3.00
Self Paced														
	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	1/ 20	E 00	E 00	1 61	2 22	E 00
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 28	5.00	5.00		3.33	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 16	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	27/ 27	2.00	2.00	4.54	2.63	2.00
To a control of the c														

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 340L 0101 Title ELECTR FOR SCIENTISTS Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1311

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mear
Questions		INA						Mean	Ralik		Mean	Mean	Mean	Meai
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.5
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.21	4.24	4.18	4.6
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1144/1566	3.75	3.81	4.07	4.04	3.7
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.71	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.7
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	757/1650	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.06	4.11	4.06	4.7
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.67	5.0
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.7
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.37	4.32	4.24	4.7
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.24	4.00	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.01	4.10	4.12	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.11	4.29	4.30	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.13	4.31	4.33	***
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.14	4.03	4.03	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	68/ 232	4.57	4.58	4.19	4.04	4.5
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	56/ 239	4.71	4.59	4.21	3.99	4.7
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	4.74	4.44	4.25	5.0
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.11	5.0
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	66/ 218	4.57	4.38	4.18	3.93	4.57
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		 Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 8

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

Course-Section: PHYS 408 0101 University of Maryland Page 1312 OPTICS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

Title

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

5

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

1

0

Ouestionnaires: 23

26

					eque		es .	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	388/1670	4.74	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	172/1406	4.91	4.40	4.32	4.48	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the	expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	317/1615	4.73	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute t	o what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.81	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute	to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	315/1528	4.65	4.00	4.12	4.26	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly exp	lained	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	222/1650	4.82	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	l	2	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall to	aching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	167/1626	4.81	4.06	4.11	4.28	4.81
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures we	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	138/1559	4.96	4.54	4.46	4.58	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested	l in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	101/1549	4.96	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.37	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance	your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	288/1323	4.57	4.24	4.00	4.10	4.57
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	487/1384	4.45	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.45
2. Were all students actively encoura	ged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	285/1378	4.86	4.11	4.29	4.55	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair	and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.13	4.31	4.60	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful		1	11	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	190/ 904	4.64	4.14	4.03	4.22	4.64
	Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Gualita Romail	Formant of Goods				ъ.									M	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке:	ason	ເຮ 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0		Re	quir	ed f	or M	Iajor	s	0	Graduat	e	5	Majo	r	20	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0															
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2	6-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 1								2	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	3

Electives

Other

0

21

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 424 0101 University of Maryland Page 1313 INTRO QUANTAM MECHANIC AUG 6, 2008 Title Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

				Fre	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	rever	Sect			
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	985/1670	4.27	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.27
		tor make clear			0	0	2	1	1	8	3	3.60	1479/1666	3.60	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.60
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	1021/1406	4.07	4.40	4.32	4.48	4.07
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	9	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	972/1615	4.17	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.17
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	491/1566	4.40	3.81	4.07	4.17	4.40
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	760/1528	4.20	4.00	4.12	4.26	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1043/1650	4.13	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	1	2	6	5	0	3.07	1530/1626	3.07	4.06	4.11	4.28	3.07
		Lecture																
1 Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures		orenared	0	0	0	1	4	Λ	10	4 27	1150/1559	4.27	4 54	4.46	4.58	4.27
		tor seem inter		0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	,	4.87	4.78	4.72		4.87	
			xplained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	7	2		1405/1549	3.47	4.33	4.31	4.43	3.47	
		s contribute to		0	0	1	3	2	7	2		1411/1546	3.40	4.37	4.32	4.43	3.40	
		our understanding	1	9	0	0	1	3	1		692/1323			4.00	4.10	4.00		
J. DIG GG	alovibuui	ccciniiques cin	idirec y	our underbeanding	_		Ü	Ü	_	5	_	1.00	0,2,1323	1.00	1.21	1.00	1.10	1.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	9	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1231/1384	3.17	4.01	4.10	4.32	3.17
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	9	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1282/1378	3.17	4.11	4.29	4.55	3.17
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage i	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.13	4.31	4.60	3.50
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		9	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.14	4.03	4.22	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	tribu	ıtio	n									
				_	_													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	0	A 3		Re	guire	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	1	Graduat	 е	2	Majo	or	14		
28-55	0	в 3			-			,						,				
56-83							neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 2													-	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her				1	3						

Course-Section: PHYS 607 0101 University of Maryland Page 1314 Title ELECTROMAG WAVES/RADIA Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 6

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor	_		1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam ques			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluat			2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.21	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned read			1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	339/1566	4.60	3.81	4.07	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assign	_	-	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.00	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading s		-	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.80
8. How many times wa	s class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you gra	de the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	4.40	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.40
1 Were the instruct	nrenared	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4 40	1022/1559	4.40	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.40	
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 						0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture mater		_	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures	_		1	0	0	1	0	2	2		1139/1546	4.00	4.37	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual t		-	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.00
	1	2									,					
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	ions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.01	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students	actively encourage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special tech	-	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.14	4.03	4.04	***	
	Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı										
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	0						

Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

4

Course-Section: PHYS 610 0101 University of Maryland Page 1315 NON-LINEAR OPTICS AUG 6, 2008 RUBIN, MORTON H Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													,	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.40	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.21	4.24	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.81	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.00	4.12	4.33	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.54	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.37	4.32	4.40	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.01	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.11	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.14	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1316

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title ATMOS PHYSICS II Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA Spring 2008 Enrollment: 4

Course-Section: PHYS 622 0101

Questionnaires: 4

Grad.

1

3.50-4.00

0

F

I

0

0

0

1

			E-20		ncies			Tnat	tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDO	T orrol	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	equei 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Level Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.21	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.81	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1152/1528	3.75	4.00	4.12	4.33	3.75
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1541/1650	3.25	4.37	4.22	4.30	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.54		4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1		900/1549	4.33	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1		919/1546	4.33	4.37	4.32	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	Λ	0	3 00	1260/1384	3.00	4.01	4.10	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.11	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.51	
o, bid one imperator emotarage rair and open arboarbron		ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	Ü	1.00	3,,,13,0	1.00	1.15	1.51	1.01	1.00
Freq	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
				_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	4
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0														

Electives

Other

0

2

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 640 0101 University of Maryland Page 1317 Title COMPUTATIONAL PHYSICS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN Spring 2008

Enrollment:	ь	
Ouestionnaires:	4	

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies				3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Di	d vou gain	new insights, ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.75
		ructor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Di	d the exam	questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Di	d other ev	aluations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.21	4.24	4.33	3.67
5. Di	d assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.81	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Di	d written	assignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.00	4.12	4.33	4.67
7. Wa	s the grad	ing system clearl	y expla	ained	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1404/1650	3.67	4.37	4.22	4.30	3.67
8. Ho	w many tim	es was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. Ho	w would yo	u grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.50
		Lectur	е															
1. We	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Di	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.78	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Wa	s lecture	material presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.50
4. Di	d the lect	ures contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.37	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Di	d audiovis	ual techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Di	d class di	scussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. We	re all stu	dents actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.11	4.29	4.42	4.67
3. Di	d the inst	ructor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.13	4.31	4.51	4.33
4. We	re special	techniques succe	ssful		1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.14	4.03	4.04	5.00
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credi	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ty	ne			Majors	
										<i>.</i> 								
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	3
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0											_	_		_			_
56-8	3 0		Gei	nerai	L				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	1			

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

Course-Section: PHYS 701 0101 University of Maryla Title QUANTUM MECHANICS II Baltimore County Instructor: FRANSON, JAMES Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

10

University of Maryland Page 1318
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1 Didin	0 0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.90	206/1670	4 00	4 47	4.31	1 10	4 00
1 3	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	T	9		206/1670	4.90	4.47		4.46	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					0	0	0	2	8	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.80
_		_	0	0	-	-	-	3	/	4.70	387/1406	4.70	4.40	4.32	4.36	4.70
4. Did other evaluat			0	Ţ	0	0	0	Τ	8	4.89	189/1615	4.89	4.21	4.24	4.33	4.89
5. Did assigned read	_	-	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	339/1566	4.60	3.81	4.07	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assi	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.00	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading		ained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1650	4.90	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.90
8. How many times wa			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.90
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.57
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct		prepared	0	Ω	Λ	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.90
2. Did the instructor			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture mate:		3	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.37	4.32	4.40	5.00
		-	-	1	0	0	2	1	10		,					
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	Т	U	U	2	Т	ь	4.44	384/1323	4.44	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.44
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.80
2. Were all students	s actively encourag	ged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.11	4.29	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.13	4.31	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful				2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.67
Freq				Dist	-rih	utio	n									
rtedn				DISI	اللتت	uLIUI	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Tyl	pe			Majors	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 705 0101 Title

MATHEMATICAL PHYS II

Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1319 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equei	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u cain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	206/1670	4.90	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.90
_	-	tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	173/1666		4.34	4.27	4.34	4.90
		estions reflec		_	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	191/1406		4.40	4.32	4.36	4.90
	_	ations reflect			1	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	210/1615		4.21	4.24	4.33	4.86
					1	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57			3.81	4.24	4.33	4.57
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	6							
	 Did written assignments contribute to what you learn Was the grading system clearly explained 					2	0					4.75	221/1528		4.00	4.12	4.33	4.75
				ainea	1 1	-	-	0	1	0	9	4.80			4.37	4.22	4.30	4.80
	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	861/1667		4.83	4.67	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.75
Lecture																		
1. Were t	he instru	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.80		
2. Did th	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.81	5.00			
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.80
		s contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1546		4.37	4.32	4.40	5.00
				your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	481/1323		4.24	4.00	4.03	4.33
J. Diu au	laiovisuai	techniques en	nance j	your understanding	_	7	U	U	4	U	-1	4.33	401/1323	4.33	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.33
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. Were a	ıll studen	its actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.11	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.13	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		5	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.14	4.03	4.04	4.33
		Labora	torv															
2. Were y	ou provid		_	ground information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	***	4.59	4.21	4.53	****
	_																	
1 Womo o	aaiamad +	Semina		e announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****
	_	-				-	-		-	•	1		,	****	****			****
				dividual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,			4.64	4.67	
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
		Self	Paced															
3. Were y	our conta	cts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	2.00	4.54	4.67	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
					_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	; . .
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	7	Majo	or	6
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4									•						_		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0													3				5	-
Grad. 7 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						E14	ectiv	7es				0	#### -	Means t	here s	are not	enous	rh
Grad. / 5.50-4.00 4 F 0						21.0	-CCT	v CD				5	respons				_	,
					O+1	ner					8	respons	LD LU L	o argi	ıııcaı	10		
I 0						OCI	ier.					0						

Course-Section: PHYS 722 0101 University of Maryland Page 1320 ATMOS REMOTE SENS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Instructor: HOFF, RAYMOND Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

O + I +	a	There I are to decree	0	
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

Questions						NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you	u qain new	w insights,ski	- lls from	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.21	4.24	4.33	4.67
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	3.81	4.07	4.20	4.75
6. Did wri	itten assi	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.00	4.12	4.33	4.75
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.30	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.54	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.78	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.75
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.37	4.32	4.40	4.50
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.24	4.00	4.03	5.00
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were al	ll student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.11	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair and	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.13	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.14	4.03	4.04	5.00
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
				-														
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 2		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduate	:	2	Majo	r •	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			,								
56-83	0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			C 0		Ger	nera:	l				1	Under-gr	ad	2	Non-	major	4
84-150																		
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					El	ectiv	ves				0	#### - Means there		here a	re not	enoug	h	
P 0				responses to be			e sign	significant										
I 0						Ot1	her					2						

Course-Section: PHYS 722 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County Atmos Remote Sens

I

? 0

0

Page 12 AUG 6, 2008 Title Chiu, Christine (Instr. A) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Frequencies

Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	0				-	
Questionnaires:	4		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions						NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General																		
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.75
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	622/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.50
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.67
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	903/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.13
		T	_															
1 Novo +h		Lectur ctor's lecture		nanamad	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	2		1090/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	4.83
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	900/1549	****	4.48	4.72	4.32	4.03
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	919/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.17
				our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	****	4.13	4.00		3.75
J. Dia auc	110 11 13 44 1	ccciniiques cir	ilalice y	our understanding	_	_	O	O	O	_	_	1.50	320/1323		1.13	1.00	3.71	3.73
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	5.00
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons	,			Typ	20			Majors	
										> 								,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduate	<u> </u>	2	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83						Ge	nera	1				1	Under-gr	ad	2	Non-	major	1
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0				e are not enough		ſh
	P 0												response	s to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

2

Course-Section: PHYS 722 0101 University of Maryland Page 13
Title Atmos Remote Sens Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Eze		ncies	_		Tnat	- m., a t o m	Course	Dont	TIMDO	Level	Sect
O combilers a	NTD	377	1 1	-		5 1	_		ructor		-			
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	622/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	903/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1139/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	5.00
-														
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	า									
-	_													

Credits Earned C		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						