Course-Section: STAT 121 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1591

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 61 Questionnaires: 48 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

MARFANI, ERUM F

	Questions								ncie	s	_		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	5	0	12	18	13	3.71	1402/1649	3.98	4.25	4.28	4.11	3.71
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	8	19	20	4.19	977/1648	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.16	4.19
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	6	18	23	4.36	704/1375	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.36
		ations reflect			0	25	1	2	5	7	-8		1248/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.03	3.83
				what you learned	0	12	3	2	6	13	12		1017/1533		4.22	4.04	3.87	3.81
	_	-		o what you learned	0	39	0	3	2	3	1		****/1512		4.18	4.10	3.86	****
		system clearl		-	0	1	0	2		15	25	4.34	, -	4.39	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.34
		was class cance			0	1	0	0	2	41	4		1528/1646		4.67	4.69		4.04
	-			hing effectiveness	13	3	0	3	5	17			1087/1621					3.88
	would you grade the overall teaching effectiv												, .					
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	the instru	prepared	2	0	0	0	4	9	33	4.63	683/1568	4.46	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.63		
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	3	15	28		1203/1572		4.60	4.70	4.64	4.54
3. Was le	d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	1	7	15	22	4.22	981/1564	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.22
4. Did th	as lecture material presented and explained clear d the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	2	2	9	32	4.58	618/1559	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.20	4.58
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	7	33	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/1352	4.18	3.92	3.98	3.86	****
		_	_	_														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you learned	18	0	2	6	7	6	9	3.47	1097/1384	4.09	3.83	4.08	3.86	3.47
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	18	0	3	9	2	6	10	3.37	1243/1382	3.88	3.92	4.29	4.03	3.37
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	18	0	2	1	9	4	14	3.90	1032/1368	3.99	3.98	4.30	4.01	3.90
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	_	17	24	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 948	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.75	****
				Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	 1	A 13		Red	guire	ed f	or M	aior	s 1	.4	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В 17							-			-	-	) •		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C 7		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad 4	8	Non-	-major	48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 1									3		-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
J_ uu.	Ü	2.20 1.00	-	P 0				. 0.0				-	respons					,
				I O		Ot.1	her				2	23	I COPOID		91			
				? 2							_	-						
				• -														

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment:

35 Questionnaires: 28

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1592 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	0	3	7	11	7	3.79	1361/1649	3.98	4.25	4.28	4.11	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	17	6	4.04	1106/1648	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.16	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	11	14	4.32	743/1375	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1148/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.03	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	9	14	4.30	584/1533	4.25	4.22	4.04	3.87	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	651/1512	3.98	4.18	4.10	3.86	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	12	10	4.11	968/1623	4.39	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	19	7	4.27	1391/1646	4.26	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	7	10			1209/1621		4.01	4.06	3.96	3.74
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	16	9	4.21	1153/1568	4.46	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	11	16		1212/1572	4.58	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	13			1073/1564	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	14			1088/1559	4.40		4.29	4.20	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	508/1352	4.18	3.92	3.98	3.86	4.26
	_	•	_	-	_	-			,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	2	6	11	3.96	840/1384	4.09	3.83	4.08	3.86	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	5	5	10		1022/1382	3.88	3.92	4.29	4.03	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	4	9	7	4.00	948/1368	3.99	3.98	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	619/ 948	3.89	3.97	3.95		3.71
1. Were special techniques successivi	,		_	U	2	_	,	3.71	015/ 510	3.05	3.57	3.75	3.73	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	2	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.14	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	23		U	U	U		_	1.50	/ 333		3.73	4.20	1.11	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.43	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 288	***	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	23	_	U	U		U		4.00	/ 200		4.13	3.00	3.54	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.00	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.09		****
	25	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25 25	1	0	0	0	1			, 52	****			4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	Τ	U	U	U	1	Τ	4.50	****/ 312		1.50	3.68	3.51	
Colf Daged														
Self Paced	20	^	0	0	0	2	_	1 75	22/ 52	A 7F	1 75	4 20	1 17	1 75
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	22/ 53	4.75	4.75		4.17	4.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	8/ 30	4.57	4.57	4.16	4.06	4.57
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	21/ 41	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.50
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	18/ 24	3.86	3.86	4.42	4.24	3.86
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 110	***	2.00	3.99	3.83	***

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KE

KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1592 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-		_	
				?	0						

Title INTRO STATISTICS: SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2008

Page 1593 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain new	v insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	6	9	3	3.74	1386/1649	3.98	4.25	4.28	4.11	3.74
		or make clear			0	0	0	1	4	7	7		1094/1648		4.33	4.23	4.16	4.05
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	529/1375	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.53
		ations reflect			0	6	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	759/1595		4.33	4.20	4.03	4.31
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4		4.26	614/1533		4.22	4.04	3.87	4.26
		_		o what you learned	0	17	0	0	1	1	0		****/1512		4.18	4.10	3.86	****
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	1	3	6			861/1623		4.39	4.16	4.08	4.21
		vas class canc			2	0	0	0	0	11			1325/1646		4.67	4.69		4.35
9. How wo	uld you gr	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	8	Τ	3.77	1184/1621	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.96	3.77
		Lecture																
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	2	1	8			1198/1568		4.51	4.43	4.39	4.16
		or seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	3	4			1265/1572		4.60	4.70	4.64	4.47
				explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	9			1105/1564		4.29	4.28	4.20	4.05
		contribute to			0 1	0	2	0	4	8			1289/1559		4.37	4.29		3.74
5. Did au	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understar  Discussion					5	1	3	1	2	6	3.69	955/1352	4.18	3.92	3.98	3.86	3.69
		Discus	sion															
		what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	774/1384		3.83	4.08	3.86	4.07		
				d to participate	4	0	0	1	3	4		4.13	905/1382		3.92	4.29		4.13
		_		d open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	900/1368		3.98	4.30	4.01	4.14
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		5	10	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 948	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab incı	rease understa	nding c	of the material	14	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.08	****
				or lab activities	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did th	e lab inst	tructor provid	e assis	tance	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	***
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced s	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.75	4.75	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did st	udy questi	ions make clea	r the e	expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	4.57	4.57	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were y	our contac	cts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was th	e feedback	k/tutoring by p	proctor	s helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	3.86	3.86	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	3.83	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	рe			Majors			
00-27	2 1	0.00-0.99	1 0	A 9 B 6		кес	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83		1.00-1.99				000	nera:	1				1	IIndon -	mad 1	L9	Non	maiaz	19
	5-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 2 1-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0						iera.	Т				Τ.	Under-9	ırau l	LJ	Non-	major	19
							ectiv					2	#### -	Meane +	here :	re not	enous	h
Grau.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						=CLT,	v C S				4	respons				_	11
						Otł	ner				1	0	T CBPOILE	CD CO I	JC 5191.	iiiican		
	I 0 ? 0										-	-						

Title INTRO STATISTICS: SOC S

11010 11111001100

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 25

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1594 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	7	12	4.16	1057/1649	3.98	4.25	4.28	4.11	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	585/1648	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.16	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4		4.75	296/1375	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	5	5		4.21	865/1595	4.26		4.20	4.03	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	7		4.48	399/1533	4.25		4.04	3.87	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	883/1512	3.98			3.86	4.00
		12	0	2							4.18	4.10		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	•	-		2	8		4.28	780/1623	4.39		4.16	4.08	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	17	7		1412/1646	4.26	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	13	4	4.11	859/1621	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.96	4.11
Lecture		_	_	_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	9	12		943/1568	4.46	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	9	14		1146/1572	4.58	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	9		4.50	651/1564	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	586/1559	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.20	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	633/1352	4.18	3.92	3.98	3.86	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	644/1384	4.09	3.83	4.08	3.86	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	893/1382	3.88	3.92	4.29	4.03	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	934/1368	3.99	3.98	4.30	4.01	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	365/ 948	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.75	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	***	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.14	****
or word requirements for raw reports ordarry specifical		Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	_	1.50	, 555		3.73	1.27		
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	24	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 200		4.13	3.00	3.54	
Field Work														
	2.4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	2 72	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24			-	-	1	-		,	****	****		3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****		4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39		****	4.47	4.36	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	1.50	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced				_	_	_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 53	4.75		4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	4.57	4.57	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 24	3.86	3.86	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	3.83	****

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1594 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	0						

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 8

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1595 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	644/1649	3.98	4.25	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1648	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1375	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.10	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	-	5.00	1/1595	4.26	4.33		4.03	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2		4.43	454/1533	4.25		4.04	3.87	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	0			1170/1512	3.98	4.18	4.10	3.86	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1623	4.39	4.39		4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5			1310/1646	4.26	4.67		4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5		4.17				4.06	3.96	4.17
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		_	U	U	U	5	1	4.1/	709/1021	3.93	4.01	4.00	3.90	4.1/
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4 00	207/1560	1 10	A F1	1 12	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	287/1568	4.46	4.51		4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	931/1572	4.58	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1564	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1559	4.40	4.37		4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	208/1352	4.18	3.92	3.98	3.86	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	326/1384	4.09	3.83	4.08	3.86	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1057/1382	3.88	3.92	4.29	4.03	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1059/1368	3.99	3.98	4.30	4.01	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	601/ 948	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.75	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.14	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	,	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 333		3.73	1.27	1.11	
Seminar														
	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	1 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		-	-	-	-	-	_		,	****	****		4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85			4.47	4.30	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	1.50	3.68	3.51	****
									•					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.75	4.75	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	4.57	4.57	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.27	****
	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24					****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	-	•	_			3.86 ****	3.86	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	/	U	U	U	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 110	^^^	2.00	3.99	3.83	* * * * *

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1595 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Questions

Instructor: HUANG, YI Enrollment: 79

Questionnaires: 53

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1596 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### 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 Mean

2. Did the i 3. Did the e 4. Did other 5. Did assig 6. Did writt 7. Was the g 8. How many	nstructor maxam question evaluations ned readingsen assignmen rading systetimes was cl	ake clear  ns reflect  s reflect  contrik  nts contr  em clear  lass canc	the explanation of the explanati	xpected goals pected goals what you learned o what you learned	2 2 3 2 4 5 4 5	0 0 0 5 4 9 0	2 1 0 2 1 1 0 0	0 1 2 3 1 2 1 0 2	11 8 7 4 7 5 6 0	16 13 11 13 10 13 10 9	22 28 30 24 26 18 32 39	4.29 4.38 4.17 4.31 4.15 4.49 4.81	1122/1 850/2 684/2 916/2 565/2 791/2 528/2 816/2	1648 1375 1595 1533 1512 1623	3.77 3.82 4.05 3.81 3.79 3.71 4.07 4.91 3.45	4.25 4.33 4.56 4.33 4.22 4.18 4.39 4.67 4.01	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.27 4.18 4.22 4.21 4.05 4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02	
<ol> <li>How would</li> <li>Were the</li> </ol>		Lectur	re	_	4	0	1	2	5	16	29		1041/1		4.12	4.51	4.43	4.02	4.35
3. Was lectu 4. Did the l	re material ectures cont	presente tribute t	ed and e	n the subject  Explained clearly  You learned  Our understanding	4 6 3 4	0 0 1 14	0 2 5 4	1 4 1 3	3 10 7 5	10 12 11 4	35 19 25 19	3.89 4.02	1133/1 1224/1 1111/1 830/1	1564 1559	4.13 3.50 3.70 3.28	4.60 4.29 4.37 3.92	4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	4.61 3.89 4.02 3.89
2. Were all	students act nstructor er	tively er ncourage	oute to ncourage fair an	what you learned d to participate d open discussion	19 20 21 20	0 0 0 22	9 4 3 1	3 1 2 1	2 6 3 1	7 7 7 1	13 15 17 7	3.85 4.03	1148/1 1053/1 939/1 ****/	1382 1368	3.60 3.92 3.88 ****	3.83 3.92 3.98 3.97	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.11 4.37 4.39 4.00	3.35 3.85 4.03 ****
<ol> <li>Were you</li> <li>Did the 1</li> </ol>	provided wit ab instructo	th adequa or provid	anding o ate back de assis	f the material ground information tance early specified	52 52 52 52	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 1	5.00 5.00	****/ ****/ ****/	243 209	* * * * * * * * * * * *	**** 5.00 5.00 3.75	4.16 4.12 4.35 4.29	4.07 3.89 4.12 4.22	* * * * * * * * * * * *
2. Was the i	nstructor av	vailable	to the	announced theme ividual attention what you learned	52 52 52	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	5.00	****/ ****/	88 85 81	**** ****	**** **** 4.00	4.54 4.47 4.43	4.63 4.55 4.30	* * * * * * * * * * * *
	_		ate to w	nat you learned uation criteria	52 52	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00 5.00	****/ ****/	52 48	**** ****	* * * * * * * *	4.06 4.09	3.59 4.21	* * * * * * * *
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu												
Credits Earn		Cum. GP <i>I</i>		Expected Grades					ason					Тур 	e 			Majors	; ·
28-55 56-83	2 1.0 9 2.0	00-0.99 00-1.99 00-2.99	0 0 2	A 29 B 7 C 2			quire neral		or M	ajor		0		duate er-gr		3	Majo Non-	major	0 53
		00-3.49 50-4.00	10 7	D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 4		Ele Oth	ectiv ner	/es				0 5			eans t s to b			enoug	rh

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 68
Questionnaires: 29

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1597 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			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	0	0	2	1	1 2	10	1	2 45	1513/1649	3.77	4.25	4.28	4.27	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	13	2		1543/1648	3.82	4.33	4.23	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	٥	4	5	15	5		1127/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.22	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	12	5	6		1425/1595	3.81	4.33	4.20	4.21	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	4	8	5	6		1362/1533	3.79	4.22	4.04	4.05	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	6	6	2	0		1371/1512	3.79	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	8	6	9		1327/1623	4.07	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	U	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1646	4.07	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	4	12	6	1		1491/1621	3.45	4.01	4.06	4.02	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-		_	-	12	U	_	3.00	1491/1021	3.43	1.01	1.00	7.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	7	11	8	3.89	1350/1568	4.12	4.51	4.43	4.39	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	10	8	7	3.64	1526/1572	4.13	4.60	4.70	4.64	3.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	11	10	1	3.11	1489/1564	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.25	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	0	9	8	5	3.38	1412/1559	3.70	4.37	4.29	4.23	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	5	3	4	5	1	2.67	1287/1352	3.28	3.92	3.98	3.97	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	3	9	3.84	916/1384	3.60	3.83	4.08	4.11	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	946/1382	3.92	3.92	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	7	3	7	3.74	1105/1368	3.88	3.98	4.30	4.39	3.74
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 85

Questionnaires: 40

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1598 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			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	0	0	1	0	3	13	23	4.43	749/1649			4.28	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	28	4.68	349/1648	3.69	4.33	4.23	4.18	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8		4.75	296/1375	4.03	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	2	3	9	17	4.22	865/1595	3.65	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	3	10	14	4.32	555/1533	3.97	4.22	4.04	4.05	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	639/1512	3.75	4.18	4.10	4.11	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	13	25	4.55	448/1623	3.85	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	35	5	4.13	1491/1646	4.58	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	270/1621	3.45	4.01	4.06	4.02	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	32	4.78	442/1568	3.76	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	30		1003/1572	4.07	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74			4.29	4.28	4.25	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	8	30		405/1559		4.37	4.29	4.23	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	26	1	1	1	3	3		****/1352		3.92	3.98	3.97	****
J. Did dudiovisual techniques children your understanding	3	20	_	_	_	5	3	3.07	, 1332	2.71	3.72	3.70	3.57	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	3	6	3	15	3.80	937/1384		3.83	4.08	4.11	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	5	10	3	12		1110/1382	3.32	3.92	4.29	4.37	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	4	9	2	11		1154/1368	3.24	3.98	4.30	4.39	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	10	21	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	****/ 948	3.20	3.97	3.95	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 555	***	3.75	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
<ol> <li>Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme</li> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> </ol>	39	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	39	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 200		4.13	3.00	3.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	1.50	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	4.50	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****
5. Here share shough proceeds for all the students	3,7	J	J	J	J	_	J	1.00	, 110		2.00	3.77	1.05	

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor:

DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 85
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1598 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	39
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30	-			
				?	1						

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor: ROY, ATUL

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2008

Page 1599 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Questions					NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructo: Rar			e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	u gain nev	v insights,skil		m this course	0	0	1	1	10	7	1	3.30	1548/1	L649	3.67	4.25	4.28	4.27	3.30
2. Did th	e instruct	or make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	3	1	5	9	2	3.30	1555/1	L648	3.69	4.33	4.23	4.18	3.30
3. Did th	e exam que	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	2	2	3	8	5	3.60	1169/1	L375	4.03	4.56	4.27	4.22	3.60
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	2	2	3	7	3	3.41	1440/1	L595	3.65	4.33	4.20	4.21	3.41
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	6	6		1065/1		3.97	4.22	4.04	4.05	3.75
		_		o what you learned	0	5	3	1	2	5	4		1320/1		3.75	4.18		4.11	
		system clearly		ined	0	0	2	3	3	6			1367/1		3.85	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.55
		vas class cance			0	1	0	1	0	2			945/1		4.58	4.67	4.69	4.67	
9. How wo	uld you gi	rade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	4	0	2	6	4	0	3.17	1473/1	L621	3.45	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.17
		Lecture	9																
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lectures	well ;	prepared	2	0	1	2	7	3	5	3.50	1460/1	L568	3.76	4.51	4.43	4.39	3.50
2. Did th	e instruct	or seem intere	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1480/1	L572	4.07	4.60	4.70	4.64	3.94
				xplained clearly	3	0	3	3	2	5	4	3.24	1464/1	L564	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.25	3.24
		s contribute to			3	0	1	2	6	4			1381/1		3.71	4.37	4.29	4.23	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	4	5	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1153/1	L352	2.94	3.92	3.98	3.97	3.27
	Discussion																		
1. Did cl	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	4	2	2	2	2	2.67	1335/1	L384	3.17	3.83	4.08	4.11	2.67
2. Were a	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	3	2	3	2	2	2.83	1347/1	L382	3.32	3.92	4.29	4.37	2.83
3. Did th	e instruct	or encourage f	air an	d open discussion	8	0	4	1	3	4	0	2.58	1344/1	L368	3.24	3.98	4.30	4.39	2.58
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succes	ssful		8	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	811/	948	3.20	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.20
		Laborat	cory																
1. Did th	e lab inci	rease understar	nding o	f the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequat	e back	ground information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were n	ecessary r	materials avail	lable f	or lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did th	e lab inst	tructor provide	assis	tance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	209	****	5.00	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were r	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****
		Self I	aced																
1. Did se	lf-paced s	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	53	***	4.75	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clear	the e	xpected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	30	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****
4. Was th	e feedback	k/tutoring by p	proctor	s helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	24	****	3.86	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for	all t	he students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****
	Fr						trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons					Тур	oe .			Majors	
	·														- 				
	00-27					Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	1	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		<b>~</b> -		,				1	TT3				37		20
	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 4 D 0					Ger	nera:	T				1	unde	er-gi	rad 2	20	Non-	major	20
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					רק.	ectiv	a				0	###1	4 _ N	Moona +	here a	ro not	onous	h
91au. 0 3.30-4.00 3 F 0					ЕТ€	=C L T \	v C S				U				nere a De sign		_	11	
I O						O+1	ner				1	2	1001	-0110		oc praii	cai.		
? 0						0.01					_	_							

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor: ROY, ATUL

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 33

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1600 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				_	ncie		_		tructor		_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	9	11	5	3.27	1555/1649	3.67	4.25	4.28	4.27	3.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	13	11	2	3.09	1587/1648	3.69	4.33	4.23	4.18	3.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	11	8	10	3.73	1127/1375	4.03	4.56	4.27	4.22	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	3	8	7	4	3.33	1470/1595	3.65	4.33	4.20	4.21	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	6	9	12	3.84	986/1533	3.97	4.22	4.04	4.05	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	4	6	4	7	3.55	1240/1512		4.18	4.10	4.11	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	8	13			1410/1623		4.39	4.16	4.08	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	4			731/1646				4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	4	3	6	9	1	1	2.55	1582/1621	3.45	4.01	4.06	4.02	2.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	4	5	6	7	3	3.00	1515/1568			4.43	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	4	10	6			1535/1572			4.70	4.64	3.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	7	5	9	3			1545/1564				4.25	2.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	7	3	6	3			1498/1559					2.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	6	1	3	3	2	2.60	1293/1352	2.94	3.92	3.98	3.97	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	2	6	7	6	3.03	1252/1384	3.17	3.83	4.08	4.11	3.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	11	5	7	3.38	1240/1382	3.32	3.92	4.29	4.37	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	3	7	6	8		1154/1368		3.98		4.39	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	4	22	1	3	2	0	1	2.57	****/ 948	3.20	3.97	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	5.00		4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	1	1	0	1	2		****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28 28	2	1	1	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	1	0	1	2	1		****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****
Freque			tribu	utio	n									
Quadita Bassad Quadas				Do					П				Mojora	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	В	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	С	14	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0			_		_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	2	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 28

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Instructor: ABERC Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 26 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1601 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	3	14	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.12
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	920/1648	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.18	4.23
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	1	10	13	4.31	763/1375	4.55	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.31
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	3	11	10	4.12	996/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.12
				what you learned	0	8	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	935/1533	3.88	4.22	4.04	4.05	3.89
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	3	5	10	6	3.79	1095/1512	3.80	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.79
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	6	7	13	4.27	803/1623	4.41	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.27
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	266/1646	4.98	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	13	4	3.95	987/1621	4.02	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.95
		Lectur	-															
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50		4.68	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.50
	s lecture material presented and explained clear				1	0	0	0	2	10	13		1289/1572	4.56	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.44
	s lecture material presented and explained clear			1	0	0	0	1	2	12	11	4.27	929/1564		4.29	4.28	4.25	4.27
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:				0	0	1	0	4	6	15		931/1559	4.44	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.31
5. Did	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				1	9	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	1160/1352	3.45	3.92	3.98	3.97	3.25
		Discus							_		_							
				what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	8	9	3.84			3.83	4.08	4.11	3.84
				d to participate	1	0	4	2	8	6	5		1278/1382	3.08	3.92	4.29	4.37	3.24
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	1	0 20	5 1	3 0	4 1	4 2	9 1		1219/1368 ****/ 948	3.32	3.98 3.97	4.30 3.95	4.39 4.00	3.36
		Labora	tory															
5. Were	e requireme		-	early specified	23	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did	conference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	23	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	1.50	3.68	3.60	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were	e there eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	he students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	s Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27								ed f	 or M	 'a i o v		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 11		1/6	darr	cu I	OT I	۱۰۰ م	۵.	U	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	U
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	26	Non-	-major	26
84-150						00.	c. a	_				-	onder 9	2		1,011		20
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
	P 0												respons				_	
				I 0		Ot:	her				2	13	-					
				3 0														

INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Title ABERCROMBIE, MA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 76 Questionnaires: 45

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1602 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	_			_							4 05	4 00	4 05	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	10	14	18		1122/1649	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.09
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	1 1	0	0	0	5 3	16 5	23 36	4.41 4.75	702/1648	4.37 4.55	4.33 4.56	4.23 4.27	4.18 4.22	4.41 4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	<i>5</i>	11	23	4.75	296/1375 685/1595	4.35	4.33	4.27	4.22	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	3	11	9	11		1139/1533	3.88	4.22	4.20	4.05	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	10	16	10		1075/1512	3.80	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	11	29	4.55	459/1623	4.41	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	43			4.98	4.67		4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	8	20	5		1060/1621		4.01		4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	9	33	4.68	604/1568	4.68	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	12	28		1212/1572	4.56	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	12	28	4.53	620/1564	4.48	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	7	28	4.48	736/1559	4.44	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	6	6	10	5	7	3.03	1216/1352	3.45	3.92	3.98	3.97	3.03
Discussion	_													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	16	9	9	3	3		1359/1384	2.87	3.83	4.08	4.11	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	13	5	8	7 9	6		1352/1382	3.08	3.92	4.29	4.37	2.69
<ol> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> <li>Were special techniques successful</li> </ol>	8 8	0 31	9 2	4 0	2	2	6 0		1294/1368 ****/ 948	3.32	3.98 3.97	4.30	4.39 4.00	2.97
4. Were special techniques successiul	0	31	4	U	۷	۷	U	2.07	"""/ 940		3.91	3.95	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	5.00	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	U	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	0	0	0	2		,	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
<ol> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	42 42	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	4.00	4.43	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 288	***	5.00 4.13	4.35	4.46 3.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	42	Τ.	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 200		4.13	3.00	3.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	***	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43 43	1 1	0	0	0	0	1 1		,	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 312		1.50	3.68	3.60	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	1			****	4.50	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	***	3.86	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1602 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	44	Non-major	45
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	36	_			
				?	0						

INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Title Instructor: KATZOFF, MYRON

Enrollment: 65

Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1603 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean		Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	11	14	4.09	1122/1649	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	20	4.47	614/1648	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	25	4.59	472/1375	4.55	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	3	7	15	4.30	770/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	4	10	9	4.08	761/1533	3.88	4.22	4.04	4.05	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	4	7	10	3.80	1089/1512	3.80	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	9	19	4.41	635/1623	4.41	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1646		4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	14	9	4.19	754/1621	4.02	4.01	4.06	4.02	4.19
T o who we														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4 07	207/1560	1 (0	<i>1</i> F1	1 12	4.39	4 07
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1 1	0	0	0	2	2 5	28	4.87	287/1568	4.68	4.51	4.43 4.70		4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5 5	24 24	4.71	1022/1572 498/1564	4.56 4.48	4.60	4.70	4.64 4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5 6	22	4.55	651/1559		4.29 4.37	4.28	4.23	4.65 4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	0	4	1	8	4.55	650/1352		3.92	3.98		4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	Τ0	1	U	4	1	8	4.07	050/1352	3.45	3.92	3.98	3.97	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	11	0	6	2	5	2.58	1342/1384	2.87	3.83	4.08	4.11	2.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	6	3	2	5	9	3.32	1253/1382	3.08	3.92	4.29	4.37	3.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	1	5	5	10	3.64	1133/1368	3.32	3.98	4.30	4.39	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	7	21	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory			_	_										
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.12	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	***	3.75	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 312	****	1.50	3.68	3.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****
1 Should shought products for all the beautiful	20		J	3	J	J		5.00	, 110		2.00	2.22	1.05	

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: KAT

KATZOFF, MYRON

Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1603 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				?	0						

Title INTRO PROBABILITY THEO

Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2008

Page 1604 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	ructor	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	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	603/1649	4.54	4.25	4.28	4.50	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	614/1648	4.46	4.33	4.23	4.36	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	370/1375	4.69	4.56	4.27	4.48	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	417/1595	4.57	4.33	4.20	4.36	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	915/1533	3.90	4.22	4.04	4.14	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1512	****	4.18	4.10	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	757/1623	4.31	4.39	4.16	4.27	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1166/1646	4.54	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	870/1621	4.08	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	330/1568	4.85	4.51	4.43	4.54	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.60	4.70	4.79	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	887/1564	4.31	4.29	4.28	4.40	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	662/1559	4.54	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1352	***	3.92	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1384	****	3.83	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1382	****	3.92	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.98	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	***	3.97	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	506/ 555	2.75	3.75	4.29	4.41	2.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	215/ 288	3.25	4.13	3.68	3.71	3.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	1.50	3.68	3.95	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.22	***

Title INTRO PROBABILITY THEO

Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1604 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: STAT 454 0101 Title

APPLIED STATISTICS

Instructor: STANWYCK, ELIZA

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1605 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1		16	4.83	247/1649		4.25	4.28	4.50	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	244/1648		4.33	4.23	4.36	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2		15	4.72	334/1375		4.56	4.27	4.48	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1		15	4.82	180/1595		4.33	4.20	4.36	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	774/1533		4.22	4.04	4.14	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2		12	4.63	- , -		4.18	4.10	4.26	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1		16	4.83	154/1623		4.39	4.16	4.27	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0				782/1646			4.69		4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	535/1621	4.38	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	147/1568	4.94	4.51	4.43	4.54	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1572		4.60	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	473/1564		4.29	4.28	4.40	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	361/1559		4.37	4.29	4.41	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1			4.75	157/1352		3.92		4.07	
• •														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	1	2		1122/1384		3.83	4.08	4.35	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	2		946/1382		3.92	4.29	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	1	0	2		1266/1368		3.98	4.30	4.58	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.41	****
Seminar														
	1.0	1	0	^	0	^	1	F 00	**** 00	****		4 54	1	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1 0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 88 ****/ 85	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	-	-	-	-	-	1		,	****		4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	U	0	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	***	4.13	3.68	3.71	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	***	****	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 312	****	1.50	3.68	3.95	****
Calf David														
Self Paced	1 17	0	0	^	^	^	1	F 00	****/ F2		4 75	4 20	1 (1	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	***	4.75	4.30	4.64	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	***	4.57	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	***	4.50	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	4.85	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.22	****

Course-Section: STAT 454 0101
Title APPLIED STATISTICS

Instructor: STANWYCK, ELIZA

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1605 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 601 0101 University of Maryland APPLIED STATISTICS I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Page 1606 FEB 11, 2009 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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.25	4.28	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1375	4.71	4.56	4.27	4.44	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.22	4.04	4.28	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.39	4.16	4.29	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1621	4.83	4.01	4.06	4.20	4.83
Loghuma														
Lecture			0	0	0	2	_	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.51	4.43	4.52	4.71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	0	0	∠ 1	5 6	4.71	715/1572	4.71	4.51	4.43	4.83	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.29	4.70	4.63	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	263/1352		3.92	3.98	4.10	4.57
	_		-	-	-	_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.83	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.92	4.29	4.52	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	796/1368	4.33	3.98	4.30	4.56	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6 6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.87	****

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

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Title APPLIED STATISTICS II
Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8

Page 1607 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluat	ion	Question	ınaire
---------	--------	---------	-----	----------	--------

Questions				NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1649		4.25	4.28	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648		4.33	4.23	4.34	4.75
	_	uestions reflec		1 3	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375		4.56	4.27	4.44	4.63
		uations reflect			0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595		4.33	4.20	4.35	5.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	594/1533		4.22	4.04	4.28	4.29
		_		o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512		4.18	4.10	4.35	5.00
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	220/1623		4.39	4.16	4.29	4.75
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646		4.67	4.69	4.81	
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.01	4.06	4.20	4.57
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did th	oid the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1564	4.88	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.88
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.92	3.98	4.10	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.83	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.92	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.98	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.03	****
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	requiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	470/ 555	3.50	3.75	4.29	4.66	3.50
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
a 1'. =	- 1	a ana						_					_					
Credits E	=arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 4					Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					jh
				P 0								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0		Other						7						

1

Course-Section: STAT 611 0101 University of Maryland
Title MATHEMATICAL STAT I Baltimore County
Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA Fall 2008

Ρ

I

?

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

2

University of Maryland Page 1608
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

2

responses to be significant

		Ouestionnaire

					Frequencies				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 you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.22	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.18	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.39	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.01	4.06	4.20	5.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.52	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.83	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.83	4.08	4.30	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382		3.92		4.52	5.00
		_	_	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1368		3.98		4.56	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credita E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pos	asons	,			Ту	ne			Majors	
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade									· - – – – -								, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General				0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	major	0			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	

Other

Course-Section: STAT 616 0101 University of Maryland Page 1609 Title NONPARAMETRIC STATISTI Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			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	Λ	Ο	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	4	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.22	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.39	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.67	4.69	4.81	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.01	4.06	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.60	4.43	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	342/1564		4.29	4.70	4.63	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.29	4.29	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	U	U	U	U	U	1	3	4.75	390/1339	4.75	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	3.83	4.08	4.30	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.92	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.98	4.30	4.56	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	107/ 110	2.00	2.00	3.99	3.92	2.00

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

Course-Section: STAT 618 0101 University of Maryland Title APPL MULTIVARIATE METH

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG 10

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1610 FEB 11, 2009

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 4 0 4 4.00 1183/1649 4.00 4.25 4.28 4.46 4.00 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 0 4 4.00 1183/1649 4.00 4.25 4.28 4.46 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 2 1 0 5 4.00 1124/1648 4.00 4.33 4.23 4.34 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1375 5.00 4.56 4.27 4.44 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 497/1595 4.50 4.33 4.20 4.35 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 476/1533 4.40 4.22 4.04 4.28 4.40 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 1 5 4.25 687/1512 4.25 4.18 4.10 4.35 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 1 0 0 0 6 4.43 608/1623 4.43 4.39 4.16 4.29 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 1081/1646 4.63 4.67 4.69 4.81 4.63 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 1 3 2 3.86 1105/1621 3.86 4.01 4.06 4.20 3.86 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 852/1568 4.50 4.51 4.43 4.52 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 1339/1572 4.38 4.60 4.70 4.83 4.38 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 2 0 5 4.13 1064/1564 4.13 4.29 4.28 4.41 4.13 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 0 0 5 3.88 1211/1559 3.88 4.37 4.29 4.41 3.88 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 423/1352 4.38 3.92 3.98 4.10 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 3.83 4.08 4.30 \*\*\*\* 7 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 3.92 4.29 4.52 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 3.98 4.30 4.56 \*\*\*\* Laboratory

#### Field Work

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 303/312 1.50 1.50 3.68 3.83 1.50

7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 3.75 4.29 4.66 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned		rned Cum. GPA			l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	Major	7	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enough	1		
				P	0			responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	2	_				
				2	2							

Course-Section: STAT 619 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title BIOSTATISTICS Instructor: HUANG, YI Fall 2008

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							<b>-</b> .		~		IMDO I arra		0	
Ouestions	NTD	NT 70	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	_		ructor Rank	Course Dept Mean Mean				
Questions	NK	NA				- <del>4</del> 	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean 	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1649	4.88	4.25	4.28	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.56	4.27	4.44	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.33	4.20	4.35	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.22	4.04	4.28	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.18	4.10	4.35	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.39	4.16	4.29	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67		4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	374/1621		4.01		4.20	4.50
7. now would you grade the overall teaching circultumess	2	O	O	O	O	3	5	1.50	371/1021	1.50	1.01	1.00	1.20	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.51	4.43	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.60	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	524/1564	4.63	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.92	3.98	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.83	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.92	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	3.98	4.30	4.56	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.97	3.95	4.03	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.87	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.58	****
	7		0	0	0	-	_		,	****	****			****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	-		0	1		, 52	****		4.38	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	U	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	1.50	3.68	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	3.92	****
1 Substitution of the second se	•	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	J	ŭ	_	3.00	, 110			2.22	5.52	
Frequency Distribution														

Page 1611

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there		

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{\mbox{P}}} \quad \mbox{\ensuremath{\mbox{0}}} \quad \mbox{\ensuremath{\mbox{0}}}$ 

Course-Section: STAT 700 0101

TOP:STAT MTHD/DATA ANA

Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1612 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0 0 0	0 0 3 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 0 1	3 3 1 3	4.75 4.75 5.00 4.75	328/1649 263/1648 1/1375 236/1595	4.75 4.75 5.00 4.75	4.25 4.33 4.56 4.33	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20	4.46 4.34 4.44 4.35	4.75 4.75 5.00 4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 1	0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 1 1	3 3	4.75 4.75 5.00 4.75 3.33	180/1533 194/1512 1/1623 913/1646 1429/1621	5.00 4.75	4.22 4.18 4.39 4.67 4.01	4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	4.75 4.75 5.00 4.75 3.33
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 1	4 4 3 3 2	5.00 5.00 4.75 4.75 5.00	1/1568 1/1572 342/1564 390/1559 1/1352	4.75 4.75	4.51 4.60 4.29 4.37 3.92	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.52 4.83 4.41 4.41 4.10	5.00 5.00 4.75 4.75 5.00
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3 3 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 0	1 0 1	5.00 4.00 5.00	1/1384 946/1382 1/1368	5.00 4.00 5.00	3.83 3.92 3.98	4.08 4.29 4.30	4.30 4.52 4.56	5.00 4.00 5.00
Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3 3 2	0 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1		1/ 243 1/ 209 1/ 555	5.00 5.00 5.00	5.00 5.00 3.75	4.12 4.35 4.29	4.61 4.80 4.66	5.00 5.00 5.00
Seminar 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear			0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0	0 1 1		63/ 81 1/ 92 1/ 288	4.00 5.00 5.00	4.00 5.00 4.13	4.43 4.35 3.68	4.43 4.42 3.87	4.00 5.00 5.00
Frequence Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	iency	ncy Distribution  Reasons							Туј	Majors				
00-27		Gei	- neral	 ed fo	or Ma			2	Graduat	e rad	3 1	Majo Non-	r major	4
P 0 I 0 ? 0	Electives Other							0	#### - Means there are not responses to be significar					111