

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1591
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	0	12	18	13	3.71	1402/1649	3.98	4.25	4.28	4.11	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	19	20	4.19	977/1648	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.16	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	18	23	4.36	704/1375	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	1	2	5	7	8	3.83	1248/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.03	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	2	6	13	12	3.81	1017/1533	4.25	4.22	4.04	3.87	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	39	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	****/1512	3.98	4.18	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	15	25	4.34	708/1623	4.39	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	41	4	4.04	1528/1646	4.26	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	3	5	17	7	3.88	1087/1621	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	9	33	4.63	683/1568	4.46	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	15	28	4.54	1203/1572	4.58	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	7	15	22	4.22	981/1564	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	9	32	4.58	618/1559	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.20	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	33	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/1352	4.18	3.92	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	17	24	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 948	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 6	C 7	General 2	Under-grad 48 Non-major 48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 2		

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
 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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	3.74	1209/1621	3.93	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	4.54	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	9	4.11	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	9	4.07	1088/1559	4.40	4.37	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	3.91	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	3.75	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	4.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.14	****	
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	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	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	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	1.50	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	22/ 53	4.75	4.75	4.30	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	****	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
 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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	9	3	3.74	1386/1649	3.98	4.25	4.28	4.11	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	1094/1648	4.35	4.33	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	529/1375	4.59	4.56	4.27	4.10	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	759/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	614/1533	4.25	4.22	4.04	3.87	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1512	3.98	4.18	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	861/1623	4.39	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1325/1646	4.26	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	8	1	3.77	1184/1621	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.96	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	8	8	4.16	1198/1568	4.46	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	1265/1572	4.58	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	1105/1564	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	8	5	3.74	1289/1559	4.40	4.37	4.29	4.20	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	3	1	2	6	3.69	955/1352	4.18	3.92	3.98	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	774/1384	4.09	3.83	4.08	3.86	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	905/1382	3.88	3.92	4.29	4.03	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	900/1368	3.99	3.98	4.30	4.01	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 948	3.89	3.97	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.75	4.75	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	4.57	4.57	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	3.86	3.86	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0203
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	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	19	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	9	4.21	865/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	399/1533	4.25	4.22	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	4.18	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	13	4.28	780/1623	4.39	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	17	7	4.24	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	4.43	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	4.61	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	12	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	4.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.14	****	
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	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	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	4.00	****/ 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	4.50	****/ 53	4.75	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	4.50	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0203
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	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	4	5.00	1/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.25	4.22	4.04	3.87	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	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	8	5.00	1/1623	4.39	4.39	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1310/1646	4.26	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	789/1621	3.93	4.01	4.06	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	287/1568	4.46	4.51	4.43	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	8	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	8	5.00	1/1559	4.40	4.37	4.29	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	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	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	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	5.00	****/ 41	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.86	3.86	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204
 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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	0	11	16	22	4.10	1122/1649	3.77	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	8	13	28	4.29	850/1648	3.82	4.33	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	7	11	30	4.38	684/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	2	3	4	13	24	4.17	916/1595	3.81	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	1	7	10	26	4.31	565/1533	3.79	4.22	4.04	4.05	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	9	1	2	5	13	18	4.15	791/1512	3.71	4.18	4.10	4.11	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	6	10	32	4.49	528/1623	4.07	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	9	39	4.81	816/1646	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	2	12	16	9	3.82	1132/1621	3.45	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	5	12	29	4.35	1041/1568	4.12	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	10	35	4.61	1133/1572	4.13	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	4	10	12	19	3.89	1224/1564	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.25	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	5	1	7	11	25	4.02	1111/1559	3.70	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	4	3	5	4	19	3.89	830/1352	3.28	3.92	3.98	3.97	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	9	3	2	7	13	3.35	1148/1384	3.60	3.83	4.08	4.11	3.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	4	1	6	7	15	3.85	1053/1382	3.92	3.92	4.29	4.37	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	2	3	7	17	4.03	939/1368	3.88	3.98	4.30	4.39	4.03	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	22	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	4						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0301
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1597
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	12	10	4	3.45	1513/1649	3.77	4.25	4.28	4.27	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	13	3	3.34	1543/1648	3.82	4.33	4.23	4.18	3.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	15	5	3.72	1127/1375	4.05	4.56	4.27	4.22	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	12	5	6	3.44	1425/1595	3.81	4.33	4.20	4.21	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	4	8	5	6	3.27	1362/1533	3.79	4.22	4.04	4.05	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	6	6	3	8	3.27	1371/1512	3.71	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	8	6	9	3.64	1327/1623	4.07	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	4	12	6	1	3.08	1491/1621	3.45	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.08	
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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3.67	4.25	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	31	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	4.72	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	374/1564	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	8	30	4.74	405/1559	3.71	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	26	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	****/1352	2.94	3.92	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	3	6	3	15	3.80	937/1384	3.17	3.83	4.08	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	5	10	3	12	3.73	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	3.57	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	3.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.58	****	
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	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: ROY, ATUL
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1599
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	10	7	1	3.30	1548/1649	3.67	4.25	4.28	4.27	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	9	2	3.30	1555/1648	3.69	4.33	4.23	4.18	3.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	8	5	3.60	1169/1375	4.03	4.56	4.27	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	2	3	7	3	3.41	1440/1595	3.65	4.33	4.20	4.21	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	6	6	3.75	1065/1533	3.97	4.22	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	1	2	5	4	3.40	1320/1512	3.75	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	3	6	6	3.55	1367/1623	3.85	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	945/1646	4.58	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	4	0	2	6	4	0	3.17	1473/1621	3.45	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	7	3	5	3.50	1460/1568	3.76	4.51	4.43	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1480/1572	4.07	4.60	4.70	4.64	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	3	2	5	4	3.24	1464/1564	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.25	3.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	4	4	3.47	1381/1559	3.71	4.37	4.29	4.23	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1153/1352	2.94	3.92	3.98	3.97	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	2	2	2	2.67	1335/1384	3.17	3.83	4.08	4.11	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	3	2	2	2.83	1347/1382	3.32	3.92	4.29	4.37	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	3	4	0	2.58	1344/1368	3.24	3.98	4.30	4.39	2.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	811/ 948	3.20	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	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	3.75	4.18	4.10	4.11	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	8	13	6	3.45	1410/1623	3.85	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	731/1646	4.58	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.87	
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	3.76	4.51	4.43	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	4	10	6	6	3.54	1535/1572	4.07	4.60	4.70	4.64	3.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	7	5	9	3	2	2.54	1545/1564	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.25	2.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	7	3	6	3	6	2.92	1498/1559	3.71	4.37	4.29	4.23	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	3.58	1154/1368	3.24	3.98	4.30	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	4.33	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	3.89	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	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	3.40	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 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	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B	7
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	2
				P	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	1
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	33
				Major	0
				Non-major	33
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	28
?	0		

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1601
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	14	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	920/1648	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	10	13	4.31	763/1375	4.55	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	11	10	4.12	996/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	7	13	4.27	803/1623	4.41	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	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 overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	13	4	3.95	987/1621	4.02	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	852/1568	4.68	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	1289/1572	4.56	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	12	11	4.27	929/1564	4.48	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	15	4.31	931/1559	4.44	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	1160/1352	3.45	3.92	3.98	3.97	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	8	9	3.84	916/1384	2.87	3.83	4.08	4.11	3.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	2	8	6	5	3.24	1278/1382	3.08	3.92	4.29	4.37	3.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	3	4	4	9	3.36	1219/1368	3.32	3.98	4.30	4.39	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	20	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	1.50	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	10	14	18	4.09	1122/1649	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	16	23	4.41	702/1648	4.37	4.33	4.23	4.18	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	36	4.75	296/1375	4.55	4.56	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	6	11	23	4.37	685/1595	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	3	11	9	11	3.67	1139/1533	3.88	4.22	4.04	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	10	16	10	3.82	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	199/1646	4.98	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	8	20	5	3.91	1060/1621	4.02	4.01	4.06	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	4.53	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	2.20	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	6	2.69	1352/1382	3.08	3.92	4.29	4.37	2.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	9	4	9	9	6	2.97	1294/1368	3.32	3.98	4.30	4.39	2.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	31	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	****/ 948	****	3.97	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	****/ 209	****	5.00	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	0	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	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	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	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	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	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	0	0	1	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	****/ 41	****	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	****	

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: KATZOFF, MYRON
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1603
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

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	4.98	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	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	287/1568	4.68	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	1022/1572	4.56	4.60	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	24	4.65	498/1564	4.48	4.29	4.28	4.25	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	22	4.55	651/1559	4.44	4.37	4.29	4.23	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	650/1352	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	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: KATZOFF, MYRON
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1603
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 451 0101
 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5.00	****/ 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	4.00	****/ 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	****	

Course-Section: STAT 451 0101
 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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	247/1649	4.83	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	4.78	4.33	4.23	4.36	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	334/1375	4.72	4.56	4.27	4.48	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	180/1595	4.82	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	4.07	4.22	4.04	4.14	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.18	4.10	4.26	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	154/1623	4.83	4.39	4.16	4.27	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.67	4.69	4.71	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	5.00	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	4.67	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	4.78	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	157/1352	4.75	3.92	3.98	4.07	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1122/1384	3.40	3.83	4.08	4.35	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.92	4.29	4.56	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1266/1368	3.20	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. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	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	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.75	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.57	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 601 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS I
 Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1606
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.51	4.43	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.60	4.70	4.83	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	263/1352	4.57	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	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.00	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	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	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.13	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS II
 Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1607
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	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	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	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375	4.63	4.56	4.27	4.44	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	594/1533	4.29	4.22	4.04	4.28	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.18	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	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	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.01	4.06	4.20	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	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	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	0	1	7	4.88	197/1564	4.88	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.88	
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	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.92	3.98	4.10	4.00	
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	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.98	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	470/ 555	3.50	3.75	4.29	4.66	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 611 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT I
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1608
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1/1649	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.39	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	0	0	0	2	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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.92	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.98	4.30	4.56	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 616 0101
 Title NONPARAMETRIC STATISTI
 Instructor: WANG, XIAO
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1609
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	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	4	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	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	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	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 618 0101
 Title APPL MULTIVARIATE METH
 Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1610
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	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	6	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	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	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	3.92	4.29	4.52	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.98	4.30	4.56	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	3.75	4.29	4.66	****	
Field Work															
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	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 619 0101
 Title: BIOSTATISTICS
 Instructor: HUANG, YI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1611
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	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	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	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.01	4.06	4.20	4.50
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	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 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	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	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	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	3.86	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.00	3.99	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	5	
?	2			

Course-Section: STAT 700 0101
 Title TOP:STAT MTHD/DATA ANA
 Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1612
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	328/1649	4.75	4.25	4.28	4.46	4.75	
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	0	1	3	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	0	1	3	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.22	4.04	4.28	4.75	
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	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.39	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	4.01	4.06	4.20	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	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	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.92	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.83	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.92	4.29	4.52	4.00	
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	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.80	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	3.75	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	63/ 81	4.00	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.13	3.68	3.87	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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