Course-Section: STAT 121 0101 University of Maryland Title

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S Baltimore County

JUN 13, 2006 Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D (Instr. A) Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 35 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 3 5 11 9 7 3.34 1404/1481 3.59 4.19 4.29 4.14 3.34 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 7 11 13 3.89 1130/1481 4.04 4.33 4.23 4.18 3.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 4 3 10 17 4.09 861/1249 4.22 4.42 4.27 4.14 4.09 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 1 3 3 7 14 4.07 923/1424 4.16 4.18 4.21 4.06 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 7 4 2 4 5 13 3.75 918/1396 3.72 3.86 3.98 3.89 3.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 2 1 6 10 8 3.78 974/1342 3.86 4.18 4.07 3.88 3.78 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 4 7 10 13 $3.86 \ 1086/1459 \ 4.16 \ 4.39 \ 4.16 \ 4.17 \ 3.86$ 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 34 $4.97 \ 211/1480 \ 4.89 \ 4.76 \ 4.68 \ 4.64 \ 4.97$ 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 3 2 13 8 1 3.07 1346/1450 3.40 4.03 4.09 3.97 2.98 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 2 3 4 6 19 4.09 1128/1409 4.47 4.58 4.42 4.36 4.09 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 1 3 4 9 17 4.12 1292/1407 4.58 4.65 4.69 4.57 4.12 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 2 3 8 12 9 3.68 1192/1399 4.06 4.35 4.26 4.23 3.68

Page 1416

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 3 2 2 11 15 4.00 1017/1400 4.26 4.38 4.27 4.19 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 28 1 0 0 3 2 3.83 ****/1179 4.32 3.64 3.96 3.85 **** Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 4 4 9 10 4 3.19 1096/1262 3.17 3.41 4.05 3.77 3.19 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 7 4 6 6 8 3.13 1156/1259 3.35 3.67 4.29 4.06 3.13 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 3 5 7 8 7 $3.37 \, 1130/1256 \, 3.60 \, 3.82 \, 4.30 \, 4.08 \, 3.37$

4. Were special techniques successful 4 22 0 2 3 2 2 3.44 631/788 3.45 3.26 4.00 3.80 3.44 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 **** 246 **** **** 4.20 3.93 ****

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32 0 0 1 0 1 3.67 **** 249 **** **** 4.11 3.95 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 242 **** **** 4.40 4.33 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 32 0 0 1 0 0 2 4.00 **** 240 **** 4.20 4.20 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 32 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.04 4.02 ****

Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 34 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 4.49 4.54 ****

0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 69 **** **** 4.53 4.18 **** 34 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 3.92 3.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 59 **** **** 4.30 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 34 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 51 **** **** 4.00 3.44 **** 34 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** **** 4.60 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation

Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.55 4.48 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 34 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.75 4.42 ****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Туре Majors 00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 15 Required for Majors 12 Graduate 0 Major 28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 10
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 6 C 5 General
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives General 1 Under-grad 35 Non-major 11 1 #### - Means there are not enough

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 20 ? 2

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1417

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 3 5 11 9 7 3.34 1404/1481 3.59 4.19 4.29 4.14 3.34 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 7 11 13 3.89 1130/1481 4.04 4.33 4.23 4.18 3.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 4 3 10 17 4.09 861/1249 4.22 4.42 4.27 4.14 4.09 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 1 3 3 7 14 4.07 923/1424 4.16 4.18 4.21 4.06 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 7 4 2 4 5 13 3.75 918/1396 3.72 3.86 3.98 3.89 3.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 2 1 6 10 8 3.78 974/1342 3.86 4.18 4.07 3.88 3.78 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 4 7 10 13 3.86 1086/1459 4.16 4.39 4.16 4.17 3.86 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 34 4.97 211/1480 4.89 4.76 4.68 4.64 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 25 1 2 1 3 2 1 2.89 1388/1450 3.40 4.03 4.09 3.97 2.98 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 27 0 1 0 2 3 2 3.63 ****/1409 4.47 4.58 4.42 4.36 4.09 0 0 1 5 4.29 ****/1407 4.58 4.65 4.69 4.57 4.12 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 28 0 1 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 27 0 1 0 1 4 2 3.75 ****/1399 4.06 4.35 4.26 4.23 3.68 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 ****/1400 4.26 4.38 4.27 4.19 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 30 4 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1179 4.32 3.64 3.96 3.85 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 9 10 4 3.19 1096/1262 3.17 3.41 4.05 3.77 3.19 8 3.13 1156/1259 3.35 3.67 4.29 4.06 3.13 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 7 4 6 6 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 3 5 7 8 7 3.37 1130/1256 3.60 3.82 4.30 4.08 3.37 4. Were special techniques successful 4 22 0 2 3 2 2 3.44 631/ 788 3.45 3.26 4.00 3.80 3.44 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 **** / 246 **** **** 4.20 3.93 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32 0 0 1 0 1 3.67 **** / 249 **** **** 4.11 3.95 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** / 242 **** **** 4.40 4.33 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 32 0 0 1 0 0 2 4.00 **** 240 **** 4.20 4.20 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 32 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.04 4.02 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 34 0 0 3.00 ****/ 68 0 4.00 ****/ 69 **** **** 4.53 4.18 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 34 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 3.92 3.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 34 0 Field Work 0 1.00 ****/ 59 **** **** 4.30 4.00 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 Ω 0 Ω 0 1.00 ****/ 51 **** **** 4.00 3.44 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 34 0 0 0 1 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** **** 4.60 5.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 34 0 0 0 0 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.55 4.48 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 34 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.75 4.42 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	des Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	в 10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C 5	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 20 ? 2

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1418

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR Enrollment:

FIII OTTIMETIC.	09				
Questionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			eque:	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	4	2	3	6	7	3 45	1372/1481	3 59	4 19	4 29	4 14	3.45
0						7							3.86
0	1	0	1	2	9	9		, -					4.24
0	3	1	0	4	5	9				4.18	4.21	4.06	4.11
1	1	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	1025/1396	3.72	3.86	3.98	3.89	3.60
1	1	1	4	2	6	7	3.70	1018/1342	3.86	4.18	4.07	3.88	3.70
1	1	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	550/1459	4.16	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.45
0	0	1	0	1	1	19	4.68	936/1480	4.89	4.76	4.68	4.64	4.68
4	2	1	2	7	6	0	3.13	1338/1450	3.40	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.13
1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4 57	682/1409	4 47	4 58	4 42	4 36	4.57
1	-	-	0	1	2								4.81
	-	-	-			9							3.95
1	1	1		2	7	9	4.10						4.10
1	5	1	0	2	5	8	4.19						
1	0	5	2	6	1	7	3.14	1117/1262	3.17	3.41	4.05	3.77	3.14
1	0	3	3	3	3	9	3.57	1083/1259	3.35	3.67	4.29	4.06	3.57
1	0	-	2	2	3	11	3.81	1025/1256	3.60	3.82	4.30	4.08	3.81
1	11	4	0	1	1	4	3.10	710/ 788	3.45	3.26	4.00	3.80	3.10
1encs	nie:	tribi	ıt i oʻ	n									
acricy	DIS	CIID	2010.										
			Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
	Red	 auire	ed f	or Ma	aior	 s	4	Graduat	 e	0	Maio		0
									-	-) •		-
	Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-a	rad 2	2	Non-	major	3
								5				3	
Electives 0 #### - Means there are						re not	enous	ŗh					
								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	Otl	her				1	7	_		_			
	0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 4 2 2 1 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	NR NA 1 0 0 4 0 0 2 0 1 0 0 3 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 4 2 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 1 1 1 1 5 1 1 0 5 1 0 3 1 0 3 1 11 4 Hency Distribution	NR NA 1 2 0 0 4 2 0 0 2 1 0 1 0 1 0 3 1 0 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 4 1 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 4 2 1 2 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 5 1 0 1 0 5 2 1 0 3 3 1 0 3 2 1 11 4 0 Deency Distribution Required f General Electives	NR NA 1 2 3 0 0 4 2 3 0 0 2 1 2 0 1 0 1 2 0 3 1 0 4 1 1 2 2 4 1 1 1 4 2 1 1 0 1 2 0 0 1 0 1 4 2 1 2 7 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 5 1 0 2 1 0 5 2 6 1 0 3 3 3 1 0 3 2 2 1 11 4 0 1 Reason: Required for Magerial Electives	0 0 4 2 3 6 0 0 2 1 2 10 0 1 0 1 2 9 0 3 1 0 4 5 1 1 2 2 4 6 1 1 1 4 2 6 1 1 0 1 2 4 0 0 1 0 1 1 4 2 1 2 7 6 1 0 0 1 1 4 1 0 0 0 1 2 1 0 2 1 2 7 1 1 1 1 2 7 1 5 1 0 2 5 1 0 5 2 6 1 1 0 3 3 3 3 3 1 0 3 2 2 3 1 11 4 0 1 1 Deency Distribution Reasons Required for Major General Electives	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 0 0 4 2 3 6 7 0 0 2 1 2 10 7 0 1 0 1 2 9 9 0 3 1 0 4 5 9 1 1 2 2 4 6 6 1 1 1 4 2 6 7 1 1 0 1 2 4 13 0 0 1 0 1 1 19 4 2 1 2 7 6 0 1 0 0 1 1 4 15 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 1 0 2 1 2 7 9 1 1 1 1 2 7 9 1 5 1 0 2 5 8 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 1 0 3 3 3 3 3 9 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 1 11 4 0 1 1 4 Deency Distribution Reasons Required for Majors General Electives	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean 0 0 4 2 3 6 7 3.45 0 0 2 1 2 10 7 3.86 0 1 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 0 3 1 0 4 5 9 4.11 1 1 2 2 4 6 6 3.60 1 1 1 4 2 6 7 3.70 1 1 0 1 2 4 13 4.45 0 0 1 0 1 1 19 4.68 4 2 1 2 7 6 0 3.13 1 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.57 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 4.81 1 0 2 1 2 7 9 3.95 1 1 1 1 2 7 9 4.10 1 5 1 0 2 5 8 4.19 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1 0 3 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1 11 4 0 1 1 4 3.10 Reasons Required for Majors 4 General 1 Electives 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank 0 0 4 2 3 6 7 3.45 1372/1481 0 0 2 1 2 10 7 3.86 1142/1481 0 1 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 757/1249 0 3 1 0 4 5 9 4.11 908/1424 1 1 2 2 4 6 6 3.60 1025/1396 1 1 1 4 2 6 7 3.70 1018/1342 1 1 0 1 2 4 13 4.45 550/1459 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 9 4.68 936/1480 4 2 1 2 7 6 0 3.13 1338/1450 1 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.57 682/1409 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 4.81 728/1407 1 0 2 1 2 7 9 3.95 1049/1399 1 1 1 1 2 7 9 4.10 985/1400 1 5 1 0 2 5 8 4.19 495/1179 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1117/1262 1 0 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1083/1259 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1025/1256 1 11 4 0 1 1 4 3.10 710/ 788 Required for Majors 4 Graduat General 1 Under-graphs of the second	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean 0 0 4 2 3 6 7 3.45 1372/1481 3.59 0 0 2 1 2 10 7 3.86 1142/1481 4.04 0 1 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 757/1249 4.22 0 3 1 0 4 5 9 4.11 908/1424 4.16 1 1 2 2 4 6 6 3.60 1025/1396 3.72 1 1 1 4 2 6 7 3.70 1018/1342 3.86 1 1 0 1 2 4 13 4.45 550/1459 4.16 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 9 4.68 936/1480 4.89 4 2 1 2 7 6 0 3.13 1338/1450 3.40 1 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.57 682/1409 4.47 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 4.81 728/1407 4.58 1 0 2 1 2 7 9 3.95 1049/1399 4.06 1 1 1 1 2 7 9 4.10 985/1400 4.26 1 5 1 0 2 5 8 4.19 495/1179 4.32 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1117/1262 3.17 1 0 3 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1083/1259 3.35 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1025/1256 3.60 1 11 4 0 1 1 4 3.10 710/ 788 3.45 Denoty Distribution Reasons Type Required for Majors 4 Graduate General Electives 0 #### - Means tresponses to be	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean 0 0 4 2 3 6 7 3.45 1372/1481 3.59 4.19 0 0 2 1 2 10 7 3.86 1142/1481 4.04 4.33 0 1 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 757/1249 4.22 4.42 0 3 1 0 4 5 9 4.11 908/1424 4.16 4.18 1 1 2 2 4 6 6 3.60 1025/1396 3.72 3.86 1 1 1 4 2 6 7 3.70 1018/1342 3.86 4.18 1 1 0 1 2 4 13 4.45 550/1459 4.16 4.39 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 19 4.68 936/1480 4.89 4.76 4 2 1 2 7 6 0 3.13 1338/1450 3.40 4.03 1 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.57 682/1409 4.47 4.58 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 4.81 728/1407 4.58 4.65 1 0 2 1 2 7 9 3.95 1049/1399 4.06 4.35 1 1 1 1 2 7 9 4.10 985/1400 4.26 4.38 1 5 1 0 2 5 8 4.19 495/1179 4.32 3.64 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1117/1262 3.17 3.41 1 0 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1083/1259 3.35 3.67 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1025/1256 3.60 3.82 1 11 4 0 1 1 4 3.10 710/ 788 3.45 3.26 Dency Distribution Reasons Type Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 General 1 Under-grad 22 Electives 0 #### - Means there a responses to be sign	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 4 2 3 6 7 3.45 1372/1481 3.59 4.19 4.29 0 0 2 1 2 10 7 3.86 1142/1481 4.04 4.33 4.23 0 1 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 757/1249 4.22 4.42 4.27 0 3 1 0 4 5 9 4.11 908/1424 4.16 4.18 4.21 1 1 2 2 4 6 6 3.60 1025/1396 3.72 3.86 3.98 1 1 1 4 2 6 7 3.70 1018/1342 3.86 4.18 4.07 1 1 0 1 2 4 13 4.45 550/1459 4.16 4.39 4.16 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 19 4.68 936/1480 4.89 4.76 4.68 4 2 1 2 7 6 0 3.13 1338/1450 3.40 4.03 4.09 1 0 0 1 1 4 15 4.57 682/1409 4.47 4.58 4.42 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 4.81 728/1407 4.58 4.65 4.69 1 0 0 1 2 1 2 7 9 3.95 1049/1399 4.06 4.35 4.26 1 1 1 1 2 7 9 4.10 985/1400 4.26 4.38 4.27 1 5 1 0 2 5 8 4.19 495/1179 4.32 3.64 3.96 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1117/1262 3.17 3.41 4.05 1 0 3 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1083/1259 3.35 3.67 4.29 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1025/1256 3.60 3.82 4.30 1 11 4 0 1 1 4 3.10 710/ 788 3.45 3.26 4.00 Dency Distribution Reasons Type Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major Reasons Type Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major Reasons Type Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major Reasons Type	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 4 2 3 6 7 3.45 1372/1481 3.59 4.19 4.29 4.14 0 0 2 1 2 10 7 3.86 1142/1481 4.04 4.33 4.23 4.18 0 1 0 1 2 9 9 4.24 757/1249 4.22 4.42 4.27 4.14 0 3 1 0 4 5 9 4.11 908/1424 4.16 4.18 4.21 4.06 1 1 2 2 4 6 6 3.60 1025/1396 3.72 3.86 3.98 3.89 1 1 1 4 2 6 7 3.70 1018/1342 3.86 4.18 4.07 3.88 1 1 0 1 2 4 13 4.45 550/1459 4.16 4.39 4.16 4.17 0 0 1 1 1 1 9 4.68 936/1480 4.89 4.76 4.68 4.64 4 2 1 2 7 6 0 3.13 1338/1450 3.40 4.03 4.09 3.97 1 0 0 1 1 1 4 15 4.57 682/1409 4.47 4.58 4.42 4.36 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 4.81 728/1407 4.58 4.65 4.69 4.57 1 0 2 1 2 7 9 3.95 1049/1399 4.06 4.35 4.26 4.23 1 1 1 1 2 2 7 9 4.10 985/1400 4.26 4.38 4.27 4.19 1 5 1 0 2 5 8 4.19 495/1179 4.32 3.64 3.96 3.85 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1117/1262 3.17 3.41 4.05 3.77 1 0 3 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1083/1259 3.35 3.67 4.29 4.06 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1025/1256 3.60 3.82 4.30 4.08 1 10 4 0 1 1 4 3.10 710/ 788 3.45 3.26 4.00 3.80 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1117/1262 3.17 3.41 4.05 3.77 1 0 3 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1083/1259 3.35 3.67 4.29 4.06 1 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1025/1256 3.60 3.82 4.30 4.08 1 0 5 2 6 1 7 3.14 1117/1262 3.17 3.41 4.05 3.77 2 0 3 3 3 3 9 3.57 1083/1259 3.35 3.67 4.29 4.06 2 0 3 2 2 3 11 3.81 1025/1256 3.60 3.82 4.30 4.08 1 11 4 0 1 1 4 3.10 710/ 788 3.45 3.26 4.00 3.80 1 2

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment:

88

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1419 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	4	15	16	4.22	896/1481	3.59	4.19	4.29	4.14	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	14	21	4.51	505/1481	4.04	4.33	4.23	4.18	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	9	23	4.46	561/1249	4.22	4.42	4.27	4.14	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	5	9	21	4.39	582/1424	4.16	4.18	4.21	4.06	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	1	4	5	8	10	3.79	893/1396	3.72	3.86	3.98	3.89	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	13	17	4.19	592/1342	3.86	4.18	4.07	3.88	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	10	22	4.47	505/1459	4.16	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	631/1480	4.89	4.76	4.68	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	12	18	4.50	334/1450	3.40	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	9	28	4.76	417/1409	4.47	4.58	4.42	4.36	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	9 7	29	4.81	728/1407	4.58	4.65	4.69	4.57	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	15	21	4.54		4.06	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	12	25	4.68	409/1400	4.26	4.38	4.27	4.19	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	13	17	4.45	299/1179	4.32	3.64	3.96		4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	Т	U	U	13	1 /	4.45	299/11/9	4.32	3.04	3.90	3.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	10	6	7	3.15	1113/1262	3.17	3.41	4.05	3.77	3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	6	6	10	10	3.59	1082/1259	3.35	3.67	4.29	4.06	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	3	6	9	13	3.85	1008/1256	3.60	3.82	4.30	4.08	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	1	1	8	4	9	3.83	509/ 788	3.45	3.26	4.00	3.80	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	1	0	1	0	2 00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.33	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.20	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	1	1		,	****	****	4.04	4.02	***
J. Were requirements for rap reports crearry specified	57	U	U	U	U			4.50	/ 21/			1.01	4.02	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0			****	****	4.42	****	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fresh activities	50	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	/ 31			1.12		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor:

KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 88 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1419 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: VALLEJOS, RONNY

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1420 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	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	2	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	384/1481	4.39	4.19	4.29	4.29	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	237/1481	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	203/1249	4.77	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	295/1424	4.38	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	2	2	4	8	3.50	1083/1396	3.45	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	725/1342	4.01	4.18	4.07	4.12	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	161/1459	4.70	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	491/1480	4.93	4.76	4.68	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	266/1450	4.43	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	75/1409	4.88	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	350/1407	4.84	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	417/1399	4.64	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	28	4.81	250/1400	4.77	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.64	3.96	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	Q	16	4.37	467/1262	3.86	3.41	4.05	4.14	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	451/1259	4.28	3.67	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	516/1256	4.26	3.82	4.30	4.34	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	22	0	1	0	1	2		****/ 788	****	3.26	4.00	4.07	****
1. Were special econniques successful	,	22	O	_	Ü	_	_	1.00	, , , , , ,		3.20	1.00	1.07	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
11040														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				?	0						

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I

Enrollment: 83 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1421 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect				
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	6	18	16	4.10	1012/1481	4.39	4.19	4.29	4.29	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	27	4.55	469/1481	4.64	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	33	4.74	261/1249	4.77	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	2	5	9	12	4.11	908/1424	4.38	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	5	1	7	6	8	3.41	1136/1396	3.45	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	2	5	6	11	3.96	806/1342	4.01	4.18	4.07	4.12	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	11	28	4.60	355/1459	4.70	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	39	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.76	4.68	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	19	10	4.26	630/1450	4.43	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	34	4.79	367/1409	4.88	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	9	32	4.74	861/1407	4.84	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	13	28	4.64	404/1399	4.64	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	9	31	4.73	336/1400	4.77	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	32	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	****/1179	4.40	3.64	3.96	4.02	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	9	8	3 34	1055/1262	3.86	3.41	4.05	4.14	3.34
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	6	6		3.90	982/1259	4.28	3.67	4.29	4.34	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	8	6	11	3.93	967/1256	4.26	3.82	4.30	4.34	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	15	23	1	0	2	1			****/ 788	****		4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
Cale Darad														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75		****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.75	4.67 4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.88	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42 42	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the beauties	12	0	J	J	J	•	_	3.00	, 21			1.02	1.07	

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I

Enrollment: 83
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1421 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	34	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	7
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	2						

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 63

Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1422 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

a	~			
SELIGENE	('Ollrge	Evaluation	()11AGE10	nnaire

			Fre	quer	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	0	0	2	1	2	10	20	4.29	805/1481			4.29	4.29	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	24	4.63	374/1481	4.20	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	20	4.49	523/1249	4.16	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	7		4.54			4.18	4.21	4.27	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	1	4	9		3.96	744/1396	3.91		3.98	4.00	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	290/1342	4.06	4.18	4.07	4.12	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	8	20	4.31	719/1459		4.39	4.16	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	31	4.80	839/1480	4.65	4.76	4.68	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	326/1450	3.80	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.52
T a who are														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	1	_	0.0	4 76	417/1400	4 4 5	4 50	4 40	4 42	4 76
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6 1	26	4.76	417/1409	4.45	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.97 4.63	200/1407	4.45 4.09	4.65	4.69 4.26	4.67	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4 3	2	24 28	4.03	431/1399 312/1400	4.03	4.35 4.38	4.20	4.27 4.28	4.63 4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	1	0	<i>3</i>	1	∠o 5	3.82	753/1179	3.33	3.64	3.96		3.82
5. Did additivisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	Τ	U	4	1	5	3.04	/53/11/9	3.33	3.04	3.90	4.02	3.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	310/1262	3.26	3.41	4.05	4.14	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	588/1259	3.43	3.67	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	2	3	19	4.46	614/1256	3.56	3.82	4.30	4.34	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	9	20	0	0	1	2	3		****/ 788	****	3.26	4.00	4.07	****
1. Note byestar sessing and basesbrar			Ū	Ū	_	_		1.55	,		3.20	1.00	1.07	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work			_											
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.75	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	***	****	4.83	4.60	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****
5. Here should chough proceeds for all the settlement	51	J	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 21			1.02	1.07	

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor:

DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment:

63 Questionnaires: 35 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1422 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Title Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 75 Questionnaires: 29

Spring 2006

Page 1423 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			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	5	4	14	6		1271/1481			4.29	4.29	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	6	5	13		1124/1481	4.20	4.33	4.23	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	7	14	4.00	893/1249	4.16	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	5	10	6		1213/1424		4.18	4.21	4.27	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	3	4	10	3.95	754/1396	3.91	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	2	5	4	7	3.89	898/1342	4.06	4.18	4.07	4.12	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	8	16	4.34		4.24	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	27	4.89	715/1480	4.65	4.76	4.68	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	2	7	6	4	3.38	1272/1450	3.80	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	8	15	4 21	1055/1409	4.45	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	2	11	11		1296/1407	4.45	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	6	7	8		1227/1399	4.45	4.35	4.26	4.07	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	0	5	8	10		1190/1400	4.03	4.38	4.27	4.28	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1		7	0	2	2	1		1152/1179	3.33	3.64	3.96	4.02	2.17
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		10	,	U	2	۷		2.1/	1132/11/9	3.33	3.04	3.90	4.02	2.1/
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	10	1	3	6	3	2.61	1213/1262	3.26	3.41	4.05	4.14	2.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	7	1	4	8	3		1174/1259	3.43	3.67	4.29	4.34	2.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	6	0	4	7	6	3.30	1139/1256	3.56	3.82	4.30	4.34	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	6	19	0	0	1	3	0		****/ 788	****	3.26	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****
Garden en														
Seminar	0.0	1	0	^	1	^	1	4 00	****/ 68		****	4 40	4 70	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0 1	0	1 1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68 ****/ 69	****	****	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1		1	0		****/ 63	****	****	4.53	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26 26	2	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.44	4.56 4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	3.92	4.43	****
J. Were Criteria for grading made crear	20	2	U	U		U	U	3.00	, 00			3.92	1.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

75

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1423 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	2						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0301 University of Maryland Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO Baltimore County Instructor: WILSON, MARY C Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 1424

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 70

	Questions							eque			_		ructor		e Dept			
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	1265/1481	3.91	4.19	4.29	4.29	3.73
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07				4.23	4.23	4.07
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	893/1249	4.16	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1242/1424	3.95	4.18	4.21	4.27	3.60
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	1	5	3.82	869/1396	3.91	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.82
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	980/1342	4.06	4.18	4.07	4.12	3.77
7. Was th	e gradino	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	2	1	0	3	9	4.07	929/1459	4.24	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.07
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1208/1480	4.65	4.76	4.68	4.65	4.27
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	3	2	8	1	3.50	1223/1450	3.80	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.50
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	913/1409	4.45	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.38
2. Did th	oid the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	1194/1407	4.45	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	976/1399	4.09	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.08
4. Did th						0	0	3	2	4	4	3.69	1173/1400	4.03	4.38	4.27	4.28	3.69
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi:					4	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	590/1179	3.33	3.64	3.96	4.02	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	3	0	4	2	3	1	2	2.58	1215/1262	3.26	3.41	4.05	4.14	2.58
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	2	0	2	3	4	3	1	2.85	1194/1259	3.43	3.67	4.29	4.34	2.85
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	3	2	3	3	2	2.92	1188/1256	3.56	3.82	4.30	4.34	2.92
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		2	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.26	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re:	ason	q			Ту	ne			Majors	ı		
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra																	
00-27							quir	ed f	or M	ajors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55								_										
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	15	Non-	major	1
84-150						_						_			_			_
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
	P 0											_	respons	es to 1	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0 Othe										1	.5						

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 16

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1425 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

									Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
1	Did	anin no	Genera w insights,ski	_	m +bia aou		1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	831/148	1 3.97	4.19	4.29	4.29	4.27
	_	_	w insignes,ski tor make clear				1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.27	399/148		4.19	4.23	4.23	4.27
			estions reflec				2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	357/124		4.33	4.23	4.23	4.64
		_	ations reflect				2	0	0	2	3	4	5		1123/142		4.18	4.21	4.27	3.86
			adings contrib				2	1	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	965/139		3.86	3.98	4.27	3.69
		-	ignments contr		_		1	2	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	504/134		4.18	4.07	4.12	4.31
			system clearl		_	rearned	2	0	0	0	0	5		4.64				4.07	4.12	4.64
			was class canc		illea		2	3	0	0	1			4.82				4.10	4.65	4.82
			was class calle rade the overa		hing offost	ironoga	8	0	0	0	2	4		4.00	836/145			4.09	4.10	4.00
۶.	now wou	ia you g	rade the overa	II LEAC	ning errect	Tvelless	0	U	U	U	4	4	4	4.00	030/143	0 3.79	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.00
			Lectur	e																
1.	Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared		2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	261/140	9 4.68	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.86
2.	Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subje	ect	3	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	1194/140	7 4.41	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.38
3.	Was lec	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained cl	learly	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	733/139	9 4.19	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.36
4.	Did the	lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	791/140	0 4.18	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.33
5.	Did aud	iovisual	techniques en	nance y	our underst	anding	3	7	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	840/117	9 3.60	3.64	3.96	4.02	3.67
1	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn							0	1	2	4	2	2	2 10	1100/126	2 2.98	3.41	4.05	4.14	3.18
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa						5 7	0	0	2	4	1	2		1136/125		3.41	4.05	4.14	3.33
			tor encourage	_	-	-	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	809/125		3.82	4.30		4.20
			chniques succe		a open arso	cussion	6	6	0	0	3	0		3.50	604/ 78			4.00	4.07	
4.	were sp	eciai te	cimiques succe	SSLUI			0	0	U	U	3	U	1	3.50	004/ /0	0 3.50	3.20	4.00	4.07	3.50
			Labora	tory																
1.	Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the mater	rial	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 24	6 ****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2.	Were yo	u provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground info	ormation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	9 ****	****	4.11	4.23	****
4.	Did the	lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance		15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	0 ****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5.	Were re	quiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early speci	fied	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	7 ****	****	4.04	4.11	****
				,																
1	Did fie	ld evner	Field ience contribu		hat woulds	rned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 5	0 ****	****	4.30	4.48	****
							15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 5	-	****	4.00	4.13	****
۷.	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria					eria	13	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 5	1		4.00	4.13	
	Self Paced																			
1.	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned						15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 5	5 ****	****	4.55	4.88	****
	Fre							Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cre	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad									Re:	asons	=			т	ype			Majors	
												- 				, pc				
0.0	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 5							Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Gradua	te	0	Majo	or	0
28	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 1 B 8											-						_		
56	5-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	1		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-	grad :	16	Non-	-major	3
0.4	150	2	2 00 2 40	1	D	0										-			-	

Electives

Other

1

12

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT Baltimore County

Instructor:

KNAPP, G.

Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 1426

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	76					
Questionnaires:	37		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	equer	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		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	lls fro	om this course	2	0	2	4	4	14	11	3.80	1225/1481	3.97	4.19	4.29	4.29	3.80
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	2	5	11	18	4.25	822/1481	4.30	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.25
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	ct the e	expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	10	23	4.62	393/1249	4.52	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.62
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	5	4	3	8	7	8	3.40	1298/1424	3.80	4.18	4.21	4.27	3.40
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	2	8	6	1	7	6	7	3.26	1199/1396	3.53	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.26
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	1	8	5	2	5	7	9	3.46	1135/1342	3.88	4.18	4.07	4.12	3.46
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	1	1	0	2	8	23	4.53	436/1459	4.44	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.53
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	celled		2	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1480	4.73	4.76	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	8	1	1	1	7	18	1	3.61	1189/1450	3.79	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.61
		Lectur	re.															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	217/1409	4.68	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.88
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	1	1	8	23	4.50	1107/1407		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50
3. Was le	s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	1	4	8	20	4.32	763/1399	4.19	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.32
4. Did th	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	2	0	5	5	22	4.32	804/1400	4.18	4.38	4.27	4.28	4.32
5. Did au	old the lectures contribute to what you learned old audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						1	0	0	2	5	4.25	****/1179	3.60	3.64	3.96	4.02	****
		Discus	scion															
1 Did al	ace dieci			what you learned	6	0	14	4	3	5	5	2 45	1228/1262	2.98	3 41	4.05	4.14	2.45
				ed to participate	6	0	6	11	5	7	2		1223/1259	3.18	3.67	4.29	4.34	
				nd open discussion	9	0	8	5	9	4	2		1218/1256		3.82	4.30		2.54
		echniques succe		a open arbeabsion	6	28	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 788		3.26	4.00	4.07	****
	_	1											,					
				Frequ	ency	7 Dis	strib	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 20							ed fo	or M	aior	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55							1	\						-	-) ~		-
56-83						Ge	enera	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	7	Non-	-major	10
84-150													J				-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 10 F 0						lecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0										3	1	_					
	I 0																	

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: KIM, JEONGEUN

Enrollment: 75

Questionnaires: 32

Page 1427 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	2	6	13	6	3 85	1193/1481	3.97	4.19	4.29	4.29	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	7	12	8	4.04	987/1481	4.30	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	13	11	4.30	710/1249	4.52	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	4	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	874/1424	3.80	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	3	6	12	3		1011/1396		3.86	3.98	4.00	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	4	0	1	6	10		3.86	912/1342		4.18	4.07	4.12	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	3	13	9	4.15	863/1459	4.44	4.39	4.16	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	14	10	4.36	1139/1480	4.73	4.76	4.68	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	6	10	3	3.75	1098/1450	3.79	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	6	4	16	4.30	1007/1409	4.68	4.58	4.42	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	9	14		1221/1407	4.41	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	0	5	8	11		1105/1399	4.19	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	5	9	10		1095/1400	4.18	4.38	4.27	4.28	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	3	0	5	9	4	3.52	887/1179	3.60	3.64	3.96	4.02	3.52
Discussion					_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	3	6	5	4		1070/1262		3.41	4.05	4.14	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	7	6	5		1079/1259	3.18	3.67	4.29	4.34	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0 2	0 1	6 2	8 1	5	3.95	950/1256		3.82	4.30	4.34	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	2	Τ	2	1	0	2.33	****/ 788	3.50	3.26	4.00	4.07	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 217	****	***	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar					_	_							. = 0	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.30	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30 30	0	0	0	1	0	1 1		****/ 63 ****/ 69	****	****	4.44 4.35	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.48 4.43	****
	50	O	_	Ü	_	O	O	2.00	, 00			3.72	1.15	
Field Work		_												
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: KIM, JEONGEUN

Enrollment: 75

Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1427 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 414 0101 University of Maryland
Title ENVIRONMENTAL STATISTI Baltimore County

? 1

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1428

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

estionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation (Ouestionnaire

					Fre	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544	a	Genera	_		1	0	0	0	1	_	_	4 20	698/1481	4.38	4.19	4.29	4 45	4 20
		new insights,ski			1	0	0	1	2	6 3	7	4.38	843/1481		4.19	4.29	4.45	4.38
		uctor make clear		-	1	0	1	0	0	3	-	4.23	,	4.46				
		questions reflec		_	1	1	0	-	-	_	9		548/1249		4.42	4.27	4.44	4.46
		luations reflect		1 2	_	1	1	2	1	2 4	7	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.35	4.17
		_		what you learned	1	_	_	2	1	-		3.67	985/1396	3.67	3.86	3.98	4.09	3.67
		-		o what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	5		4.08	707/1342		4.18	4.07	4.21	4.08
		ng system clearl		ined	1	0	1	1	2	3	6		1030/1459	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.25	3.92
	-	s was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480		4.76	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How	w would you	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.33
		Lectur																
1 Wer	re the inst	ructor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	913/1409	4.38	4.58	4.42	4.51	4.38
		uctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	11		636/1407	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.79	4.85
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	920/1399	4.15	4.35	4.26	4.36	4.15
		you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	991/1400	4.08	4.38	4.27	4.38	4.08		
		our understanding	2	3	0	1	3	4	1		877/1179	3.56	3.64			3.56		
J. DIO	a addioviba	our unacribeanaring	_	3	O	_	3	-	_	3.30	07771175	3.30	3.01	3.70	1.07	3.30		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	d class dis	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1092/1262	3.20	3.41	4.05	4.33	3.20
2. Wer	re all stud	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	821/1259	4.20	3.67	4.29	4.57	4.20
3. Did	d the instr	uctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.82	4.30	4.60	4.00
4. Wer	re special	techniques succe	ssful	_	9	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.26	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
														·				
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	2	Majo	ır.	0
	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					a		1				4	TTrades		2	Mari		2
	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0					Ge	nera	Т				4	Under-g	rau 1	.2	Non-	-major	2
							ecti					1	пппп ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. la			-la
Grad.								ves				1	#### - 1				_	ìII
		= *		0	1					_	respons	es to E	e sign	ııııcar	iL			
	I 0 Other											6						

Course-Section: STAT 453 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA Baltimore County

INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA Baltimore County WANG, XIAO Spring 2006

Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Enrollment: 7
Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1429

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 7 5.00 1/1481 5.00 4.19 4.29 4.45 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 149/1481 4.86 4.33 4.23 4.32 4.86 1/1249 5.00 4.42 4.27 4.44 5.00 437/1424 4.50 4.18 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 985/1396 3.67 3.86 3.98 4.09 3.67 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 112/1342 4.80 4.18 4.07 4.21 4.80 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 224/1459 4.71 4.39 4.16 4.25 4.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 912/1480 4.71 4.76 4.68 4.74 4.71 334/1450 4.50 4.03 4.09 4.28 4.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1409 5.00 4.58 4.42 4.51 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 659/1407 4.83 4.65 4.69 4.79 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 187/1399 4.83 4.35 4.26 4.36 4.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1400 5.00 4.38 4.27 4.38 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 442/1179 4.25 3.64 3.96 4.07 4.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1262 5.00 3.41 4.05 4.33 5.00 5 2 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1/1259 5.00 3.67 4.29 4.57 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1256 5.00 3.82 4.30 4.60 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.26 4.00 4.26 **** 0

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

Course-Section: STAT 455 0101 University of Maryland Title DESIGN QUALITY CONTROL

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1430

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8 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	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	432/1249	4.57	4.42	4.27	4.44	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	863/1424	4.14	4.18	4.21	4.35	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	950/1396	3.71	3.86	3.98	4.09	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.18	4.07	4.21	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.39	4.16	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1295/1480	4.14	4.76	4.68	4.74	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	997/1450	3.88	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	2	4	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.58	4.42	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.35	4.26	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	_		1017/1400	4.00	4.38	4.27	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	n	0	٥	0	1		****/1179	****	3.64	3.96	4.07	****
J. Dia addiovisual econniques enhance your understanding	_	U	Ü	U	U	O	_	3.00	/11/2		3.01	3.70	1.07	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	931/1262	3.67	3.41	4.05	4.33	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	3.67	4.29	4.57	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	3.82	4.30	4.60	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.26	4.00	4.26	****

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

Course-Section: STAT 490 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1
Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN S	TAT Baltimore County	JUN 13, 2

1431 2006

SINHA, BIMAL Instructor: Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.32	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.39	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.76	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.03	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.58	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.38	5.00

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

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101 University of Maryland Title

APPLIED STATISTICS II Baltimore County Instructor: KNAPP, GUIDO Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1432 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		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 Did vo	n gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.19	4.29	4.28	4.80
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.33	4.23	4.11	4.80
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.60
	_	uations reflect		-	0	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64				4.21	4.16	4.64
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	,		3.86	3.98	4.00	4.54
				o what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	104/1342	4.83	4.18	4.07	4.18	4.83
		g system clearl			2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1459		4.39	4.16	4.01	4.85
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480		4.76	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.33
	_																	
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	246/1409		4.58	4.42	4.36	4.87
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	591/1407		4.65	4.69	4.73	4.87
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.35	4.26	4.16	4.67
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.67
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	13	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1179	****	3.64	3.96	3.81	****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	acc dicc			what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	1	1	3 00	1146/1262	3.00	3.41	4.05	4.07	3.00
				d to participate	10	0	0	0	3	0	2		1027/1259		3.67	4.29	4.30	3.80
		_	_	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	809/1256		3.82	4.30	4.33	4.20
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	10	4	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 788			4.00	3.97	****
						_	-		-	-	_		,					
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Red	quire	ed i	or M	ajor	`S	0	Graduat	e	7	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		a		,				0	TT		0	37		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	Т				2	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	2
84-150	0 7	3.00-3.49	4	= -		п.	ectiv					1	ишши ,	Maana +	. la			.la
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0 P 0		ET	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	111
						∩ ±¹	h 0.70				1	2	respons	es lo E	e sign	ıııcan	L	
				I 0 ? 1		Oti	her				1	.2						
				: т														

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: STAT 612 0101 University of Maryland Title MATHEMATICAL STAT II Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Page 1433 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA		equen 2			5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	-			
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.19	4.29	4.28	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.19	4.29	4.28	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	693/1481	4.38	4.33	4.23	4.11	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.18	4.21	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	225/1396	4.63	3.86	3.98	4.00	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	93/1342	4.88	4.18	4.07	4.18	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.39	4.16	4.01	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.76	4.68	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.58	4.42	4.36	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	801/1399	4.29	4.35	4.26	4.16	4.29
4 513 13 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1	1	0 1	0	1 0	1 0	4 0		591/1400 ****/1179	4.50	4.38 3.64	4.27 3.96	4.17 3.81	4.50
	1	1	0	0	1	1			,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 5	1 6	0 1	0 0	1 0	0 0		1.00	****/1179					

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00 1146/1262	3.00	3.41	4.05	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00 1162/1259	3.00	3.67	4.29	4.30	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50 1220/1256	2.50	3.82	4.30	4.33	2.50

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

Course-Section: STAT 615 0101 University of Maryland
Title MULTIVARIATE STAT ANAL Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1434

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

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	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.19	4.29	4.28	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.11	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.18	4.21	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	136/1396	4.75	3.86	3.98	4.00	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.18	4.07	4.18	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1459	4.75	4.39	4.16	4.01	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1215/1480		4.76	4.68	4.74	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.03	4.09	3.96	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.58	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	3.41	4.05	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	3.67	4.29	4.30	5.00
			0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	3.82	4.30	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful		1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.26	4.00	3.97	3.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	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	1	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: STAT 620 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOSTATISTICS ADVANCED Baltimore County Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

6

University of Maryland Page 1435
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

C+11d 0x+	00117000	Erroluntion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		Dept UMBC Level		Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1299/1481	3.67	4.19	4.29	4.28	3.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.11	4.33
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.33
4. Did ot	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						1	0	1	0	4	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.18	4.21	4.16	4.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1136/1396	3.40	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.40
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	934/1342	3.83	4.18	4.07	4.18	3.83
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.39	4.16	4.01	4.33
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.76	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.33
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.58	4.42	4.36	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1221/1407	4.33	4.65	4.69	4.73	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	1	0	1	4	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.35	4.26	4.16	4.33
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	937/1400	4.17	4.38	4.27	4.17	4.17
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					4	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1177/1179	1.00	3.64	3.96	3.81	1.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1245/1262	2.00	3.41	4.05	4.07	2.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1247/1259	2.00	3.67	4.29	4.30	2.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1220/1256	2.50	3.82	4.30	4.33	2.50
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	781/ 788	2.00	3.26	4.00	3.97	2.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	;	1	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					4	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	0		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - Means there					βh
				Р 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					0						

Title PROB THRY/STOCH PROC I

Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH

5

Grad.

3.50-4.00

3

F

I

0

0

0

1

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1436 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eva	luation Q	uesti	.onnai	ire
--------------------	-----------	-------	--------	-----

	Quanti an a				NT 70		eque:	ncies		_		tructor Rank			e Dept				
		Questions			NA 	1 			-4 	5 	Mean	Raiir 	· 	Mean	Mean	меап	Mean	Mean	
		General																	
_	_	ew insights,skills f		0	0	3	0	2	1	5		1372/14				4.29	4.28	3.45	
		ctor make clear the		0	0	3	0	1	5	2		1380/14		3.27	4.33	4.23	4.11	3.27	
		uestions reflect the		1	0	2	0	1	3	4		1071/12			4.42	4.27	4.24	3.70	
		uations reflect the	1 3	1	1	1	1	2	1	4		1224/14			4.18			3.67	
		o what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82				3.86	3.98	4.00	3.82		
		to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2						4.18			4.09		
		g system clearly exp		0	0	2	0	4	2			1309/14			4.39	4.16		3.36	
	_	was class cancelled		1	0	2	0	0 2	4 4			997/14		4.60	4.76	4.68	4.74 3.96	4.60	
9. HOW WOL	 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 						U	2	4	U	3.00	1354/14	±50	3.00	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.00	
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	3	0	2	1	5	3.45	1302/14	109	3.45	4.58	4.42	4.36	3.45	
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	2	1	0	2	6	3.82	1337/14	107	3.82	4.65	4.69	4.73	3.82	
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	5	3	3.70	1182/13	399	3.70	4.35	4.26	4.16	3.70	
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	1	3	4	3.80	1120/14	100	3.80	4.38	4.27	4.17	3.80	
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	0	1	4.00	****/11	L79	****	3.64	3.96	3.81	****	
		Discussion																	
1. Did cla	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	1	3.00	****/12	262	****	3.41	4.05	4.07	****	
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	0	1		****/12		****	3.67	4.29	4.30	****	
	9	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/12		****	3.82	4.30	4.33	****				
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful						0	0	0	0	1		****/ 7		****	3.26	4.00	3.97	****	
		Laboratory																	
3 Were no	ececcary	materials available	for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 2	242	****	****	4.40	4.27	****	
	_	structor provide ass		10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 2		****	****	4.20	4.15	****	
		nts for lab reports		10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 2		****	****			****	
1 Wassa		Seminar	b	1.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/	68	++++	++++	4.49	4 00	****	
	-	topics relevant to t ctor available for i		10	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/	69	****	****	4.49	4.23	****	
		rojects contribute t		10 10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	63	****	****	4.53	4.46 4.44	****	
	_	ons contribute to wh	_	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	69	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute to wi	at you rearned	10	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	,	09			4.33	4.10		
		Field Work																	
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available for c	onsultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.65	****	
		Self Paced																	
3. Were yo	our conta	acts with the instru		10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	51	****	****	4.65	4.54	****	
			T		- -														
			Frequ	iency	/ DIS	LTID	ut101	[1											
Credits Ea				Rea	asons	5				Тур	рe			Majors	;				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors					 3	0	 Gradı	iat.	 ate 5		Majo	 or	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 2	Required for Majors					-	-	01440		ace 5			-	•		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General					6 Under-grad 6				Non-major		2				
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	General							onaci graa o								
01 150	-	3.00 3.19 1	E 0	Floatimag							0				. 1				

Electives

Other

0

2

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: STAT 653 0101
Title BASIC MATH STAT
Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON
Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1437 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

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

						Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		-		Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.19	4.29	4.28	4.75
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.11	4.75
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	3	5	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.63
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.18	4.21	4.16	4.83
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1396	4.80	3.86	3.98	4.00	4.80
				o what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.18	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/1459	4.88	4.39	4.16	4.01	4.88
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.76	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overal	l tead	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1450	4.88	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.88
		Lecture			_	0	0		_	_								
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.58	4.42	4.36	5.00
		tor seem intere		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1399	4.88	4.35	4.26	4.16	4.88
		s contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.38	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	lance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	152/1179	4.71	3.64	3.96	3.81	4.71
		Discuss	i on															
1 Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.41	4.05	4.07	4.50
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	783/1259	4.25	3.67	4.29	4.30	4.25
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1256	4.50	3.82	4.30	4.33	4.50
		chniques succes		a open arbeabbion	4	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 788	****	3.26	4.00	3.97	****
-	-	-																
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Required for Majors						0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4								-	1	,	2			0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					1	Under-grad 3			Non-	major	2		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	73 - 45 i - 4							0					,	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	re not	re not enough		

Other

Ρ

I

?

0

0