Course-Section: STAT 121 01

Title: Intro Statistics:Soc Sci

Instructor: Park,DoHwan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 81

| That actor. I arry borrwari | | | | _ | | | | | | 0 | - | | | 0 1 |
|---|----|----|---|---|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | | | quen | cies | | | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | | 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 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 3.60 | 1377/1528 | 3.70 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.16 | 3.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 3.96 | 1157/1527 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.23 | 3.96 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 4.08 | 962/1333 | 4.35 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.08 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 3.76 | 1240/1495 | 4.07 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.76 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 3.87 | 985/1439 | 4.05 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 3.97 | 3.87 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.27 | 1302/1425 | 3.79 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 3.93 | 3.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 3.80 | 1207/1508 | 4.15 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.11 | 3.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 4.96 | 283/1526 | 4.91 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.57 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 3.31 | 1344/1490 | 3.61 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.02 | 3.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 4.46 | 909/1428 | 4.57 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 4.42 | 1252/1436 | 4.52 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.70 | 4.42 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 4.08 | 1048/1427 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.08 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 4.00 | 1076/1425 | 4.18 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 4.10 | 674/1291 | 4.03 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 3.97 | 4.10 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 3.56 | 1053/1271 | 3.83 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 3.98 | 3.56 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 3.40 | 1184/1276 | 3.71 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 3.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 11 | 3.91 | 1009/1273 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 3.91 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2.88 | 880/922 | 3.39 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 3.87 | 2.88 |

Course-Section: STAT 121 01

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 81

TITLE.

Title: Intro Statistics: Soc Sci

Instructor: Park, DoHwan

Questionnaires: 25

| · | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/198 | *** | **** | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/208 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.23 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.56 | 4.54 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/76 | *** | **** | 4.51 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/74 | *** | **** | 4.31 | 4.43 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/66 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.15 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/76 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | **** | 3.94 | 3.82 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/42 | **** | **** | 4.00 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/41 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.74 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.09 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/43 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/31 | **** | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/36 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.33 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 9 Graduate 0 Major 0

Run Date: 2/9/2011 11:18:13 AM Page 2 of 46

| Course-S | Section | n: STAT 121 01 | | | | | Term | ı - Fal | I 2010 | O | | | | | | Enro | Ilment: | 81 |
|----------|---------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|----|----|--------|---------|--------|------|----|------|-----------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|------|
| | Title | e: <mark>Intro Statis</mark> t | ics:So | c Sci | | | | | | | , | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 25 |
| Inst | tructo | r: Park,DoHwa | ın | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | С | 5 | | Gene | ral | | | 11 | | Under-grad | 25 | | Non-ma | ajor | 25 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | | Electi | ves | | | 0 | | **** - Means | there are | not end | ugh res | oonses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | | Other | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 121 04 Title: Intro Statistics:Soc Sci Instructor: Kegan, Bonnie E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 147

| Modern Rogari, Domino E | _ | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 3.80 | 1280/1528 | 3.70 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.16 | 3.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 36 | 4.45 | 656/1527 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.45 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 41 | 4.62 | 447/1333 | 4.35 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.62 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 29 | 4.38 | 682/1495 | 4.07 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 23 | 4.23 | 678/1439 | 4.05 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 3.97 | 4.23 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 23 | 4.30 | 613/1425 | 3.79 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 3.93 | 4.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 33 | 4.51 | 448/1508 | 4.15 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.11 | 4.51 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 46 | 4.87 | 636/1526 | 4.91 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.57 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 22 | 9 | 3.90 | 1046/1490 | 3.61 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.02 | 3.90 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 41 | 4.69 | 588/1428 | 4.57 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 41 | 4.62 | 1102/1436 | 4.52 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.70 | 4.62 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 36 | 4.52 | 613/1427 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.27 | 4.52 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 33 | 4.36 | 854/1425 | 4.18 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 21 | 3.95 | 782/1291 | 4.03 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 3.97 | 3.95 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 4.11 | 750/1271 | 3.83 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 3.98 | 4.11 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 20 | 4.03 | 918/1276 | 3.71 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.03 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 19 | 4.16 | 877/1273 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.18 | 4.16 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 3.90 | 551/922 | 3.39 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 3.87 | 3.90 |

Course-Section: STAT 121 04

Title: Intro Statistics:Soc Sci
Instructor: Kegan,Bonnie E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 147

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 48 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/198 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/208 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.23 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 52 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/194 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 52 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.37 | 4.30 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 52 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/176 | *** | **** | 4.23 | 4.19 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/76 | *** | *** | 4.51 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 52 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/74 | *** | **** | 4.31 | 4.43 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 52 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.15 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/76 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/73 | *** | **** | 3.94 | 3.82 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 54 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/42 | *** | **** | 4.00 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 53 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/41 | *** | **** | 4.06 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | *** | **** | 4.74 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | *** | **** | 4.20 | 4.09 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | *** | **** | 4.34 | 4.87 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 51 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | ****/43 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 51 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/31 | **** | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 51 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/36 | *** | **** | 4.43 | 4.33 | **** |

Course-Section: STAT 121 04 Title: Intro Statistics:Soc Sci Instructor: Kegan, Bonnie E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 147

Questionnaires: 56

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 51 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 51 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/20 | **** | *** | 4.45 | 4.39 | **** |

| Credits I | Earned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | Α | 21 | Required for Majors | 26 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 8 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 17 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | С | 5 | General | 19 | Under-grad | 56 | Non-major | 56 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significan | t | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 9 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 350 01

Title: Stat W/App In Biol Sci
Instructor: Mathew,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 82

Questionnaires: 56

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|----|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 33 | 4.42 | 752/1528 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 43 | 4.76 | 248/1527 | 4.32 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 46 | 4.82 | 228/1333 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.82 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 26 | 4.17 | 932/1495 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 16 | 3.88 | 974/1439 | 4.15 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.88 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 34 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 4.33 | 583/1425 | 4.38 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 39 | 4.58 | 371/1508 | 4.37 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.58 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 22 | 4.46 | 419/1490 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.46 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 48 | 4.89 | 253/1428 | 4.43 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 44 | 4.78 | 886/1436 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 46 | 4.87 | 174/1427 | 4.21 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.87 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 50 | 4.89 | 174/1425 | 4.23 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.89 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 4.00 | 728/1291 | 3.64 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 11 | 2.88 | 1221/1271 | 3.18 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 2.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 3.47 | 1164/1276 | 3.44 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.47 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 8 | 18 | 3.72 | 1102/1273 | 3.88 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 3.72 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 36 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3.00 | ****/922 | *** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.02 | **** |

Course-Section: STAT 350 01

Title: Stat W/App In Biol Sci
Instructor: Mathew,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 82

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 48 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/198 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 50 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.17 | ****/208 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 50 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/194 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 50 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.37 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 50 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/176 | *** | **** | 4.23 | 4.33 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 49 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/76 | *** | *** | 4.51 | 4.02 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 51 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/74 | *** | **** | 4.31 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 51 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 51 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/76 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 3.68 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 52 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/73 | *** | **** | 3.94 | 4.27 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 51 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.20 | ****/42 | *** | **** | 4.00 | 3.20 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 52 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/41 | *** | **** | 4.06 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 52 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/30 | *** | **** | 4.74 | 4.80 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 52 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | *** | **** | 4.20 | 3.38 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 52 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | *** | **** | 4.34 | 4.79 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 49 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3.86 | ****/43 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | ****/31 | **** | **** | 4.53 | 4.75 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/36 | *** | **** | 4.43 | 5.00 | *** |

Course-Section: STAT 350 01

Title: Stat W/App In Biol Sci
Instructor: Mathew,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 82

Questionnaires: 56

| | | | | Fre | quend | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|-------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/21 | **** | *** | 4.54 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 50 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/20 | *** | *** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GP. | Α | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|----|----------|----------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | Α | 33 | Required for Majors | 49 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | С | 2 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 56 | Non-major | 56 |
| 84-150 | 15 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 2 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 13 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means th | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significan | t | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 350 04

Title: Stat W/App In Biol Sci
Instructor: Huang,Yi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 43

| | _ | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | 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 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 3.93 | 1205/1528 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 3.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 15 | 3.88 | 1235/1527 | 4.32 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 22 | 4.35 | 759/1333 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 4.21 | 891/1495 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.21 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 28 | 4.43 | 472/1439 | 4.15 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 16 | 4.43 | 489/1425 | 4.38 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 21 | 4.16 | 895/1508 | 4.37 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.16 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 3.56 | 1254/1490 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 3.56 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 14 | 15 | 3.98 | 1220/1428 | 4.43 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 3.98 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 29 | 4.63 | 1090/1436 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 14 | 3.55 | 1290/1427 | 4.21 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.55 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 3.56 | 1285/1425 | 4.23 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 3.56 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 3.29 | 1132/1291 | 3.64 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.29 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 3.48 | 1084/1271 | 3.18 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 3.48 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 3.42 | 1180/1276 | 3.44 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.42 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 4.04 | 931/1273 | 3.88 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 4.04 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 20 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | ****/922 | **** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.02 | **** |

Course-Section: STAT 350 04

Title: Stat W/App In Biol Sci
Instructor: Huang,Yi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 43

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/208 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.31 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/43 | *** | **** | 4.43 | 3.75 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31 | **** | **** | 4.53 | 4.75 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/36 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 5.00 | *** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | Α | 24 | Required for Majors | 38 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | С | 2 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 43 | Non-major | 43 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significan | t | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 351 01

Title: Applied Stat/Bus & Econ

Instructor: Dasgupta,Nandit

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 91

Questionnaires: 43

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 30 | 4.64 | 463/1528 | 4.61 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 35 | 4.76 | 248/1527 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 34 | 4.76 | 282/1333 | 4.74 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 19 | 4.26 | 844/1495 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 3.75 | 1064/1439 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.04 | 865/1425 | 4.11 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.04 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 4.61 | 352/1508 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.61 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 7 | 4.17 | 1350/1526 | 4.27 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.17 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 21 | 4.61 | 258/1490 | 4.61 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.61 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 34 | 4.79 | 403/1428 | 4.69 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 33 | 4.82 | 774/1436 | 4.89 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 28 | 4.68 | 392/1427 | 4.65 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.68 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 32 | 4.67 | 475/1425 | 4.53 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.31 | 504/1291 | 4.20 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.31 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 3.77 | 950/1271 | 3.95 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 3.77 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 16 | 3.67 | 1102/1276 | 3.94 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 3.83 | 1050/1273 | 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 3.83 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2.80 | ****/922 | 4.00 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.02 | *** |

| Course-S | Section: | STAT 351 0 | 1 | | | | Term | า - Fall 2 | 010 | | | | | | | Enro | <mark>Ilment:</mark> | 91 |
|------------|----------|-------------|--------|----------|-------|-----|--------|------------|--------|------|----|------|-----------------|--------------|---------|----------|----------------------|------|
| | Title: | Applied Sta | t/Bus | & Econ | | | | | | | | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 43 |
| Ins | tructor: | Dasgupta,N | landit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Frequ | enci | ies | | In: | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Fre | eque | ncy Dis | strik | buti | on | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GP. | A | Expected | Grade | es | | Rea | sons | S | | | Туре |) | | Ма | jors | |
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 26 | | Requ | ired for N | 1ajor: | S | 32 | | Graduate | 0 | | Major | | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 10 | С | 3 | | Gene | eral | | | 0 | | Under-grad | 43 | | Non-ma | ajor | 43 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | | Electi | ives | | | 0 | | **** - Means | there are | not end | ough res | ponses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | | Other | r | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 351 01

Title: Applied Stat/Bus & Econ
Instructor: Blair,Deneen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 91

| | | | | | | | In: | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|---|----|----|---|---|---|----|-----|----------|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 30 | 4.64 | 463/1528 | 4.61 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 35 | 4.76 | 248/1527 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 34 | 4.76 | 282/1333 | 4.74 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 19 | 4.26 | 844/1495 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 3.75 | 1064/1439 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.04 | 865/1425 | 4.11 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.04 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 4.61 | 352/1508 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.61 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 7 | 4.17 | 1350/1526 | 4.27 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.17 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1490 | 4.61 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.61 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1428 | 4.69 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1436 | 4.89 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1427 | 4.65 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.68 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1425 | 4.53 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 41 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1291 | 4.20 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.31 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 3.77 | 950/1271 | 3.95 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 3.77 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 16 | 3.67 | 1102/1276 | 3.94 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 3.83 | 1050/1273 | 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 3.83 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2.80 | ****/922 | 4.00 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.02 | **** |

| Course-S | Section: | STAT 351 0 | 1 | | | | Term | ı - Fall 2 | 010 | | | | | | | Enro | Ilment: | 91 |
|------------|----------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-----|--------|------------|-------|------|----|------|-----------------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|------|
| | Title: | Applied Sta | t/Bus | & Econ | | | | | | | | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 43 |
| Ins | tructor: | Blair,Denee | n | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Frequ | enci | ies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 : | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Fre | eque | ncy Dis | strik | outi | on | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GP. | Α | Expected | Grade | es | | Rea | sons | 5 | | | Турє | ; | | Maj | jors | |
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 26 | | Requ | ired for M | lajor | s | 32 | | Graduate | 0 | | Major | | 0 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 10 | С | 3 | | Gene | eral | | | 0 |) | Under-grad | 43 | | Non-ma | ajor | 43 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | | Electi | ives | | | 0 |) | **** - Means | there are | not end | ough res | ponses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | | Other | r | | | 0 |) | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 351 04

Title: Applied Stat/Bus & Econ
Instructor: Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 89

Questionnaires: 34

| · | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In: | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 20 | 4.53 | 613/1528 | 4.61 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 23 | 4.56 | 514/1527 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 25 | 4.71 | 351/1333 | 4.74 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 4.58 | 407/1495 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 21 | 4.39 | 509/1439 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.39 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 17 | 4.24 | 692/1425 | 4.11 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.24 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 24 | 4.62 | 340/1508 | 4.61 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 15 | 4.45 | 1112/1526 | 4.27 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.45 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 4.61 | 266/1490 | 4.61 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.61 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 22 | 4.59 | 746/1428 | 4.69 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 4.97 | 207/1436 | 4.89 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.97 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 25 | 4.63 | 477/1427 | 4.65 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 4.39 | 830/1425 | 4.53 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 4.08 | 684/1291 | 4.20 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.08 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 4.30 | 620/1271 | 3.95 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 4.30 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 4.48 | 622/1276 | 3.94 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.48 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 4.68 | 489/1273 | 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 4.68 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 4.00 | 467/922 | 4.00 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.00 |

Course-Section: STAT 351 04

Title: Applied Stat/Bus & Econ
Instructor: Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 89

| | l | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/198 | *** | **** | 4.16 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/208 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.56 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.37 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/176 | *** | **** | 4.23 | 4.33 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/76 | *** | **** | 4.51 | 4.02 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/74 | *** | **** | 4.31 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/66 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | ****/76 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 3.68 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | ****/73 | *** | **** | 3.94 | 4.27 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/42 | *** | **** | 4.00 | 3.20 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/41 | *** | **** | 4.06 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/30 | *** | **** | 4.74 | 4.80 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/32 | *** | **** | 4.20 | 3.38 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/29 | *** | *** | 4.34 | 4.79 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | ****/43 | *** | *** | 4.43 | 3.75 | *** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | ****/31 | *** | *** | 4.53 | 4.75 | *** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/36 | *** | *** | 4.43 | 5.00 | *** |

Course-Section: STAT 351 04

Title: Applied Stat/Bus & Econ

Instructor: Stanwyck,Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 89

Questionnaires: 34

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 29 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/20 | **** | *** | 4.45 | 5.00 | *** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 20 | Required for Majors | 29 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | С | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 34 | Non-major | 34 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significan | t | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 355 01

Title: Intro App Prob & Stat

Instructor: Gloor, Philip J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 48

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | 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 | 2 | 6 | 16 | 23 | 4.21 | 973/1528 | 4.35 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.21 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 26 | 4.32 | 841/1527 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.32 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 31 | 4.50 | 564/1333 | 4.54 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 13 | 3.90 | 1159/1495 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 3.90 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 17 | 18 | 4.20 | 718/1439 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 17 | 10 | 3.91 | 967/1425 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.91 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 27 | 4.28 | 758/1508 | 4.51 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.28 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 15 | 4.10 | 851/1490 | 4.19 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.10 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 32 | 4.56 | 794/1428 | 4.53 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 41 | 4.83 | 774/1436 | 4.89 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 26 | 4.35 | 833/1427 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 26 | 4.28 | 908/1425 | 4.40 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.28 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 3.61 | 1018/1291 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.61 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 3.61 | 1037/1271 | 2.94 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 3.61 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 25 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 3.78 | 1049/1276 | 3.49 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.78 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 25 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 3.87 | 1033/1273 | 3.70 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 3.87 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 25 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.57 | 699/922 | 3.52 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 3.57 |

Course-Section: STAT 355 01

Title: Intro App Prob & Stat

Instructor: Gloor,Philip J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 48

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/198 | *** | **** | 4.16 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/208 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.56 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.37 | 4.37 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 44 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/176 | *** | **** | 4.23 | 4.33 | **** |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | Α | 11 | Required for Majors | 41 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 23 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | С | 6 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 48 | Non-major | 48 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 1 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significan | t | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 355 04

Title: Intro App Prob & Stat

Instructor: Glezen, John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 78

| THISTI GOLDT. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | 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 | 7 | 16 | 35 | 4.48 | 661/1528 | 4.35 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 41 | 4.63 | 410/1527 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 4.63 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 41 | 4.59 | 479/1333 | 4.54 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.59 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 30 | 4.52 | 470/1495 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.52 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 24 | 4.35 | 552/1439 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.35 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 23 | 4.35 | 563/1425 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.35 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 46 | 4.74 | 201/1508 | 4.51 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 4.74 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 23 | 4.29 | 627/1490 | 4.19 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 37 | 4.50 | 854/1428 | 4.53 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 54 | 4.95 | 310/1436 | 4.89 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 16 | 33 | 4.42 | 742/1427 | 4.38 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.42 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 38 | 4.53 | 644/1425 | 4.40 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 19 | 3.95 | 782/1291 | 3.78 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.95 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 2.28 | 1254/1271 | 2.94 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 2.28 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 22 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 3.19 | 1213/1276 | 3.49 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.19 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 22 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 3.53 | 1163/1273 | 3.70 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 3.53 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 22 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 3.47 | 743/922 | 3.52 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 3.47 |

Course-Section: STAT 355 04

Title: Intro App Prob & Stat

Instructor: Glezen, John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 58

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 56 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/198 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 56 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/208 | **** | *** | 4.27 | 4.31 | **** |

| | Majors | |
|-------------|---------------------|--|
| | iviajoi s | |
| 0 | Major | 0 |
| | | |
| 58 | Non-major | 58 |
| | | |
| here are no | ot enough responses | |
| nt | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | 58 nere are r | 0 Major 58 Non-major nere are not enough responses |

Course-Section: STAT 417 01

Title: Time Series Data Anlysis

Instructor: Sinha,Bimal K

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 7

| ' | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 739/1528 | 4.43 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | 704/1527 | 4.43 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.30 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 496/1495 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 367/1439 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 301/1425 | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 586/1508 | 4.40 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 919/1526 | 4.67 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.71 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 266/1490 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 770/1428 | 4.57 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.54 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 1244/1436 | 4.43 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.75 | 4.43 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 1080/1427 | 4.00 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 785/1425 | 4.43 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.43 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1291 | 5.00 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.10 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1271 | **** | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1276 | **** | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.49 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1273 | *** | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/922 | *** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.23 | *** |

| Course-S | Section: | STAT 417 01 | | | | | Term | n - Fall 201 | 0 | | | | | | Enro | <mark>Ilment:</mark> | 15 |
|------------|----------|-------------|------|----------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|--------|----|------|-----------------|-----------|---------|----------|----------------------|------|
| | Title: | Time Series | Data | Anlysis | | | | | | | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 7 |
| Ins | tructor: | Sinha,Bimal | K | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Frequer | ncies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Fre | eque | ncy Dist | ributi | on | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | A | Expected | Grade | es | | Reasc | ns | | | Турє | ; | | Maj | jors | |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 4 | | Requ | ired for Maj | ors | 3 | 3 | Graduate | 0 | | Major | | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | | Gene | ral | | 0 |) | Under-grad | 7 | | Non-ma | ajor | 4 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | | Electi | ves | | 1 | | **** - Means | there are | not end | ough res | ponses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | | Other | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 433 01

Title: Statistical Computing
Instructor: Klein,Martin D

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 12

| <u> </u> | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.17 | 1015/1528 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4.25 | 902/1527 | 4.25 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.30 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.17 | 898/1333 | 4.17 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 369/1495 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 446/1439 | 4.44 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.44 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 301/1425 | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.17 | 895/1508 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.17 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 4.00 | 911/1490 | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1428 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.54 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 917/1436 | 4.75 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.75 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 529/1427 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 578/1425 | 4.58 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 728/1291 | 4.00 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 598/1271 | 4.33 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 926/1276 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.49 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 776/1273 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.55 | 4.33 |

Frequency Distribution

Run Date: 2/9/2011 11:18:14 AM Page 25 of 46

| Course-S | Section | : STAT 433 01 | 1 | | | | Term | ı - Fall 20 | 10 | | | | | | Enro | <mark>Ilment:</mark> | 15 |
|-----------|---------|-----------------|------|----------|-------|----|--------|-------------|-------|---|------|-----------------|-----------|---------|----------|----------------------|------|
| | Title | : Statistical C | ompu | iting | | | | | | _ | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 12 |
| Ins | tructor | : Klein,Martin | D D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Freque | ncies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | ٦ | Expected | Grade | es | | Reas | ons | | | Туре | ; | | Maj | jors | |
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | Α | 7 | | Requ | ired for Ma | jors | 4 | ļ | Graduate | 5 | | Major | | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | | Gene | ral | | 3 | 3 | Under-grad | 7 | | Non-ma | ajor | 3 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | | Electi | ves | | 5 | 5 | **** - Means | there are | not end | ough res | ponses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | | Other | | | C |) | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 451 01

Title: Intro Probability Theory

Instructor: Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 43

| Tristructor. Startwyck,Elizab | | | | Fre | guen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Ora | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | 9 | Mean | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 19 | 4.53 | 601/1528 | 4.53 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 20 | 4.50 | 575/1527 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 22 | 4.61 | 447/1333 | 4.61 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.61 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.60 | 369/1495 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3.88 | 980/1439 | 3.88 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 3.88 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 442/1425 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 4.47 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 22 | 4.65 | 306/1508 | 4.65 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.65 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 7 | 4.23 | 1313/1526 | 4.23 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.71 | 4.23 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 12 | 4.42 | 464/1490 | 4.42 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 4.42 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 24 | 4.77 | 441/1428 | 4.77 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.54 | 4.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 4.94 | 361/1436 | 4.94 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.75 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 20 | 4.55 | 577/1427 | 4.55 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 19 | 4.52 | 655/1425 | 4.52 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.52 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.29 | ****/1291 | *** | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.10 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | ****/1271 | *** | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/1276 | *** | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.49 | *** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/1273 | *** | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 28 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/922 | *** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.23 | **** |

Course-Section: STAT 451 01

Title: Intro Probability Theory

Instructor: Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 43

Questionnaires: 32

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/208 | **** | *** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/42 | **** | *** | 4.00 | 4.73 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 31 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/41 | **** | *** | 4.06 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | *** | 4.74 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | *** | 4.20 | 4.24 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/43 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.63 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/36 | **** | *** | 4.43 | 4.38 | **** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GP. | Α | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|----|----------|--------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | Α | 14 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | С | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 30 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 12 | F | 0 | Electives | 9 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significan | t | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 454 01

Title: Applied Statistics

Instructor: Park, Junyong

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 20

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.55 | 578/1528 | 4.55 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.55 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 4.40 | 737/1527 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.30 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 4.65 | 404/1333 | 4.65 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.65 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4.27 | 832/1495 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3.80 | 1020/1439 | 3.80 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 3.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.55 | 358/1425 | 4.55 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 4.55 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.42 | 558/1508 | 4.42 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.42 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 3.60 | 1239/1490 | 3.60 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 3.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.80 | 385/1428 | 4.80 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.54 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 1114/1436 | 4.60 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.75 | 4.60 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.30 | 874/1427 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.30 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.05 | 1060/1425 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 4.05 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.00 | 728/1291 | 4.00 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1271 | *** | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/1276 | *** | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.49 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/1273 | **** | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/922 | *** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.23 | **** |

Course-Section: STAT 454 01

Title: Applied Statistics

Instructor: Park,Junyong

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 20

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/198 | **** | **** | 4.16 | 4.37 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/208 | **** | *** | 4.27 | 4.21 | **** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 12 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 18 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means th | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 1 | | | to be significan | t | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 470 01

Title: Prob Actuarial Science

Instructor: Meskin, Stephen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 3

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 1140/1528 | 4.00 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 368/1527 | 4.67 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.30 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 496/1495 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 239/1439 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 396/1425 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1270/1508 | 3.67 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 3.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 919/1526 | 4.67 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.71 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1203/1490 | 3.67 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1271 | 5.00 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1276 | 5.00 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1273 | 5.00 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.55 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|-------------------|------------|------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 2 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 3 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means the | re are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |

Run Date: 2/9/2011 11:18:14 AM

| Course-Section: | STAT 470 01 | | | Term | - Fall | 2010 |) | | | | | | Enrol | Ilment: | 4 |
|-----------------|------------------------|----|----|-------|--------|------|------|---|------|---------|--------|------|---------|---------|------|
| Title: | Prob Actuarial Science | | | | | | | | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 3 |
| Instructor: | Meskin,Stephen | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Fred | quen | cies | | Ins | tructor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | I | 0 | | Other | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | ? | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 602 01

Title: Applied Statistics II

Instructor: Mathew,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 18

| ' | _ | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|--------------------|----|---|-----|------|----------|------|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4.80 | 238/1528 | 4.80 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 4.60 | 453/1527 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 1003/1333 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.27 | 832/1495 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3.67 | 1126/1439 | 3.67 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 3.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 320/1425 | 4.58 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.28 | 4.58 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.07 | 995/1508 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.07 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 177/1490 | 4.73 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.73 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1428 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 4.93 | 361/1436 | 4.93 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4.80 | 230/1427 | 4.80 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1425 | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/1291 | *** | 4.06 | 4.05 | 3.99 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.10 | 750/1271 | 4.10 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.10 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 | | | | | 696/1276 | 4.40 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 4.40 | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | | | | | | | 4.25 | 828/1273 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.52 | 4.25 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/922 | **** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |

Course-Section: STAT 602 01

Title: Applied Statistics II

Instructor: Mathew,Thomas

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 15

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/198 | *** | **** | 4.16 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/208 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.56 | 4.58 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | *** | **** | 4.37 | 4.64 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/176 | **** | **** | 4.23 | 4.66 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/42 | *** | **** | 4.00 | 3.86 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/41 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.01 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.74 | 4.95 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | *** | **** | 4.34 | 4.36 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/43 | *** | **** | 4.43 | 4.43 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/31 | *** | **** | 4.53 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/36 | *** | **** | 4.43 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.68 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/20 | *** | **** | 4.45 | 4.64 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|----------|---|--------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 6 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 9 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 5 | | | | | | |

Run Date: 2/9/2011 11:18:14 AM

| Course-S | Section | STAT 602 0 | 1 | | | | Term | ı - Fall | 2010 |) | | | | | | Enro | <mark>llment:</mark> | 18 |
|----------|---------|----------------|-----------|---|----|----|--------|----------|------|------|---|------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------------------|------|
| | Title | : Applied Stat | tistics I | I | | | | | | | | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 15 |
| Ins | tructor | : Mathew,Tho | omas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 1 | | Gene | ral | | | 0 | | Under-grad | 6 | | Non-ma | ajor | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 9 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | | Electi | ves | | | 1 | | **** - Means | there are | not end | ough resp | ponses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | | Other | • | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 603 01

Title: Categor Data Anal

Instructor: Huang,Yi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 17

| That dotor. Hading, IT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | 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 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 687/1528 | 4.46 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.92 | 1213/1527 | 3.92 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 3.92 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 393/1333 | 4.67 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 640/1495 | 4.42 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.42 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4.54 | 344/1439 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 4.54 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.33 | 583/1425 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3.67 | 1270/1508 | 3.67 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4.42 | 1152/1526 | 4.42 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.81 | 4.42 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.91 | 1046/1490 | 3.91 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 3.91 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.23 | 1093/1428 | 4.23 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.23 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 413/1436 | 4.92 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 1080/1427 | 4.00 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3.77 | 1222/1425 | 3.77 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 3.77 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.92 | 814/1291 | 3.92 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 3.99 | 3.92 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1271 | **** | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1276 | 5.00 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1273 | 5.00 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.52 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/922 | *** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |

Course-Section: STAT 603 01

Title: Categor Data Anal

Instructor: Huang,Yi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 13

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/198 | *** | **** | 4.16 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/208 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | *** | 4.56 | 4.58 | **** |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GP/ | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 8 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 9 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 4 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 9 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 611 01

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 8

Title: Mathematical Stat I Instructor: Roy, Anindya

Questionnaires: 7

| | | Frequencie NR NA 1 2 3 | | | | | | In: | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.14 | 1036/1528 | 4.14 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3.71 | 1332/1527 | 3.71 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 3.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3.43 | 1263/1333 | 3.43 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 3.43 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 496/1495 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 851/1439 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 891/1425 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.86 | 1171/1508 | 3.86 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | 1269/1490 | 3.50 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 3.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1202/1428 | 4.00 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 742/1436 | 4.83 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.17 | 1360/1427 | 3.17 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.17 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3.17 | 1360/1425 | 3.17 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 3.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1271 | **** | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1276 | *** | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.43 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1273 | *** | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.52 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

Expected Grades Reasons Credits Earned Cum. GPA Type Majors 00-27 0.00-0.99 3 Required for Majors 5 Graduate 2 Major 5

Run Date: 2/9/2011 11:18:15 AM Page 38 of 46

| Course-S | Section | n: STAT 611 01 | | | | | Term | ı - Fall | 2010 | 0 | | | | | | Enro | Ilment: | 8 |
|----------|---------|----------------|---------|---|----|----|--------|----------|------|------|---|------|-----------------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|------|
| | Title | e: Mathematic | al Stat | I | | | | | | | | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 7 |
| Ins | tructo | r: Roy,Anindya | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | | Gene | ral | | | 0 | | Under-grad | 5 | | Non-ma | ajor | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | | Electi | ves | | | 2 | | **** - Means | there are | not end | ugh resp | oonses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | | Other | • | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 651 01

Title: Basic Probability

Instructor: Sinha, Bimal K

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 13

| | NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean | | | | | | | | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----------------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 765/1528 | 4.40 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.50 | 1408/1527 | 3.50 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 3.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3.80 | 1145/1333 | 3.80 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 3.80 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3.80 | 1213/1495 | 3.80 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 3.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 851/1439 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.43 | 1251/1425 | 3.43 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.28 | 3.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3.10 | 1412/1508 | 3.10 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.10 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 742/1526 | 4.80 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.81 | 4.80 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.63 | 1227/1490 | 3.63 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 3.63 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.89 | 1270/1428 | 3.89 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 3.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 839/1436 | 4.80 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.60 | 1280/1427 | 3.60 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3.80 | 1209/1425 | 3.80 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 3.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1291 | *** | 4.06 | 4.05 | 3.99 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3.29 | 1148/1271 | 3.29 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.29 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3.86 | 1017/1276 | 3.86 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 3.86 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.43 | 1184/1273 | 3.43 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.52 | 3.43 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/208 | *** | **** | 4.27 | 4.40 | *** |

Course-Section: STAT 651 01

Title: Basic Probability

Instructor: Sinha, Bimal K

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 10

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/42 | **** | *** | 4.00 | 3.86 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/41 | **** | **** | 4.06 | 4.01 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.74 | 4.95 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/32 | **** | *** | 4.20 | 4.42 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.34 | 4.36 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/43 | **** | **** | 4.43 | 4.43 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/36 | *** | *** | 4.43 | 4.54 | **** |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | A | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|-------------------|------------|------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 5 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 6 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 4 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means the | re are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 700 01

Title: Top:Stat Mthd/Data Analy

Instructor: Park,DoHwan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 11

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 348/1528 | 4.73 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 290/1527 | 4.73 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.73 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 147/1333 | 4.91 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.39 | 4.91 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 102/1495 | 4.91 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.91 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 433/1439 | 4.45 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 4.45 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.45 | 454/1425 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.28 | 4.45 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.45 | 517/1508 | 4.45 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.45 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 4.30 | 1239/1526 | 4.30 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.81 | 4.30 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 251/1490 | 4.63 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.63 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 221/1428 | 4.91 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 964/1436 | 4.73 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 4.73 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 463/1427 | 4.64 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 515/1425 | 4.64 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 290/1291 | 4.56 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 3.99 | 4.56 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 598/1271 | 4.33 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 591/1276 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 857/1273 | 4.20 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.52 | 4.20 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/922 | *** | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.00 | *** |

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | *** | *** | 4.56 | 4.58 | **** |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 8 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 6 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 5 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 710 01

Title: Top:Math Stat/Stat Infer

Instructor: Park,Junyong

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 9

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 835/1528 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 575/1527 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1333 | **** | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 369/1495 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 132/1439 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 4.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 396/1425 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.28 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 783/1508 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.25 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 579/1490 | 4.33 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.33 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 637/1428 | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1436 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 625/1427 | 4.50 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 1076/1425 | 4.00 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 728/1291 | 4.00 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 3.99 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 644/1271 | 4.25 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 591/1276 | 4.50 | 4.02 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 637/1273 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.52 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 857/922 | 3.00 | 3.47 | 4.02 | 4.00 | 3.00 |

| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|-------------|--------|----------|-------|----|--------|-------------|-------|-----|----|------|-----------------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|------|
| Course-S | Section: | STAT 710 0 | 1 | | | | Term | ı - Fall 20 | 010 | | | | | | | Enro | Ilment: | 9 |
| | Title: | Top:Math St | tat/St | at Infer | | | | | | | , | | | | Q | uestion | naires: | 6 |
| Ins | tructor: | Park,Junyor | ng | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Frequ | encie | es | | In | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | Questions | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Fr | eque | ncy Dis | trib | uti | on | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | 4 | Expected | Grade | es | | Reas | sons | | | | Турє | ; | | Ma | jors | |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 4 | | Requ | ired for M | ajors | ; | 1 | | Graduate | 5 | | Major | | 5 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 0 | | Gene | ral | | | 0 | | Under-grad | 1 | | Non-ma | ajor | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | | Electi | ves | | | 3 | | **** - Means | there are | not end | ough res | ponses | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | | | | | | to be significa | ant | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | | Other | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: STAT 750 01

Title: Interdiscipl Consulting
Instructor: Neerchal, Nagara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 1

| | | | | Fre | quen | cies | | Ins | structor | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1113/1527 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1439 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 4.24 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1526 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.66 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1428 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1436 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.83 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1427 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1425 | 5.00 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.34 | 5.00 |

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