INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Title MARFANI, ERUM F Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1601 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	7	5	3.64	1498/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	13	4.36	833/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	763/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	946/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	867/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1416/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	1210/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	784/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	13		1248/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7		4.32	924/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5		4.45	782/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32		4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1284/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	2	3	2	2 17	1231/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	9	2		1106/1378	3.64	3.72	4.29	4.09	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	2	3	3		1276/1378	3.85	3.70	4.31	4.09	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	0	0	2			****/ 904			4.03	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	,	O	2	U	U	2		3.00	/ 504	3.91	3.20	1.03	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work	0.0	•	0	0	•	•	•	1 00		ale ale ale ale	als als als als	4 50	2 01	ale ale ale ale
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.64	4.83	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.03	****
T. was the recupact/tutoring by proctors herpful	<b>4</b> T	U	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 10		5.00	7.04	4./J	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101 Title

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

MARFANI, ERUM F Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1601 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Title MARFANI, ERUM F Instructor:

Enrollment:

34 Questionnaires: 33

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1602 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	3	10	15	4.09	1167/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	5	21	4.31	895/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	7	19	4.27	860/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	922/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	3	8	13	3.93	962/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	662/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	8	19	4.30	844/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	28	5	4.15	1437/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	6	13	6	3.75	1254/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	5	24	4.52	883/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	2	28	4.70	1054/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	7	20	4.36	864/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	8	20	4.44	808/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	3	0	0	1	5	3.56	1015/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	3	0	9		1200/1384		3.72	4.10	3.92	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	3	2	5	7	3.50	1193/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	1	2	2	11	3.75	1110/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar	0.77	0	0	0	0	1	2	4 75	****/ O7	****	****	4 65	4 60	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79			4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	4	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 75	****	***	4.57	4.46	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	3	0	0	U	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	2	2	4 20	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	4		****/ 38	****	****	4.19		***
		2		0	0		4		,	****	****		4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27 27		0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 38 ****/ 39	****	****	4.62 4.27	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		3			-	-	3		, 52	****			4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.6/	****/ 31		****	4.47	4.28	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	3	_		****/ 6	****	5.00		4.83	****
3. Hala andla chough proceeds for all the beautiful	20	_	J	J	J	5	_	1.23	, 0		3.00	1.72	1.05	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0102 Title

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

MARFANI, ERUM F Instructor:

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 33

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1602 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	 7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Title

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 16

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1603 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies			Tne	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Questions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	4	5	3.44	1557/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1409/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	5	7	3.81	1180/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1059/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	1134/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	1298/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	946/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1289/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	1	4	7	3.93	1330/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1501/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	4	6	3.86	1261/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1213/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	692/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	5	3	4	3.33	1171/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	3	5	2	1		1345/1378		3.76	4.29	4.09	2.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	0	4	2	5		1274/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	3	0	2	0			857/ 904				3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 231		5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	2	0	0	0			****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	0	0	0		,	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	***	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	2	0	0	0		,	****	***	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201 Title

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1603 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned					Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Title Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1604 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questi en s	NID	<b>3.</b> T.73		_	ncies		-		ructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3 	4		Mean	Rank 	mean 	Mean	Mean	mean	Mean 
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1486/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1363/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1057/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1234/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	4		851/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	3		1113/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.82
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	2	6	4		1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.76		4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1462/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	6		1143/1559		4.50	4.46	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	3	6		1438/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	5		1227/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	7		1056/1546	4.27		4.32	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	283/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	1	4	1		1255/1384		3.72	4.10	3.92	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	3	4	0		1325/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	1	5	0		1321/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0202 Title

INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1604 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: STAT 121 0203 University of Maryla:
Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S Baltimore County
Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE (Instr. A) Spring 2008

Enrollment:

39

University of Maryland Page 1605
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaires:	16	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
--	-----------------	----	----------------	------------	---------------

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	809/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	644/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	606/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	610/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	864/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	361/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1191/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	772/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	1	9	4.13	1449/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	816/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	768/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	257/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	603/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	439/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	305/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.38
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0203 University of Maryland Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1606

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	809/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	644/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	606/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	610/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	864/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	361/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	257/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	603/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	439/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	305/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.38
Frem	encv	Diet	ribi	1+ i 0r	1									

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

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204 University of Maryland INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Enrollment:

36

Page 1607 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE (Instr. A)

Ouestionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionn	Ouestionnaires:	14	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair
--------------------------------------------------------	-----------------	----	----------------	------------	--------------

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1216/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	892/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	d 2	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	589/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ned 2	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1097/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened	ess 2	2	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	953/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	858/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1416/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	y 1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	736/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1064/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ng 1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	619/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	i 1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	909/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1131/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	977/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.00
F	requency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	des			Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204 University of Maryland Page 1608 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1216/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	892/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	589/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1097/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.83
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	909/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1131/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	977/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204 University of Maryland Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1609

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1216/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	686/1666		4.11	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	892/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	589/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1097/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	953/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1560		4.55	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/1549		4.18	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1546		4.24	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	909/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1131/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	977/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101 University of Maryland Page 1610 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 13

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								-	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1616/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.10
_	_	ctor make clear			3	0	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	3	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1317/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.30
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	2	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1531/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.25
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	4	3	2	0	1	0	1.83	1561/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	1.83
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	2	3	0	2	2	1	2.75	1494/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	2.75
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1503/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.40
	ow many times was class cancelled ow would you grade the overall teaching effect:					0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	ow would you grade the overall teaching effect  Lecture					0	3	0	4	1	0	2.38	1603/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	2.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr		prepared	3	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1421/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	3.70	
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subje					0	1	0	5	1	3		1524/1560		4.55	4.72	4.67	3.50
				explained clearly	3	0	2	2	0	5	1		1483/1549		4.18	4.31	4.25	3.10
		es contribute t			3	0	2	2	1	4	1		1473/1546		4.24	4.32	4.24	3.00
				our understanding	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	***
		Discus	aion															
1 Did ala				what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	3	2	2 22	1171/1384	2.45	2 72	4.10	4.12	3.33
				ed to participate	5	0	3	0	1	1	3		1289/1378		3.76	4.10	4.12	3.13
				d open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	2	1		1304/1378		3.88	4.29		
				-														
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red		ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			-1~		10		_	-	or addac	-	-		-	ŭ
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	3	Non-	major	13
84-150	2.00 2.33											-			-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons				_	

Other

9

I

0

Course-Section: STAT 350 0102 University of Maryland Page 1611
Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 36

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	1292/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	4		1403/1666		4.11	4.27	4.18	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1027/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1050/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	715/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	2	2	6	3.85	1088/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1220/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	712/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	9	2	2	3.46	1405/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1157/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	8	2	5		1510/1560		4.55	4.72	4.67	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	6	3		1338/1549		4.18	4.31	4.25	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	1087/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	8	1	0	2.90	1227/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.90
Discussion	2	0	_	•		_	0	0 60	1205/1204	0 45	2 50	4 10	4 10	0.60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	4	2	2		1327/1384		3.72		4.12	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	7	2	3	0	3		1358/1378		3.76	4.29	4.30	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	Τ	5	Ţ	Τ		1357/1378		3.88	4.31	4.33	2.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	Τ	U	Τ	U	0	2.00	****/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	****
Frequ	ency	. Diet	-rih	ıtioı	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0201 University of Maryland Page 1612 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
		ew insights,skil			0	0	2	2	8	7	2		1598/1670		4.13	4.31		3.24
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	5	3	9	3		1549/1666		4.11	4.27	4.18	3.38
	_	uestions reflect		_	0	0	0	4	7	7	3		1301/1406		4.18	4.32	4.22	3.43
		uations reflect		1 3	1	1	1	4	5	4	5		1486/1615		4.17	4.24	4.18	3.42
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	1	2	8	4	4		1335/1566		3.90	4.07	4.04	3.42
		-		o what you learned	0	7	0	1	7 4	4	3		1176/1528		4.12	4.12	4.07	3.71
		g system clearly was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	0	7 0	9 21		1032/1650		4.23	4.22	4.12	4.14 5.00
	-			hi	0 1	0	2	4	11	2	2 I	5.00	1/1667 1574/1626		4.66 3.92		4.67	2.80
9. HOW WO	w would you grade the overall teaching effect:  Lecture					U	2	4	TT	2	Т	2.80	15/4/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	2.80
		Lecture	2															
1 Were tl	he instri	prepared	1	0	1	2	5	4	8	3 80	1396/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	3.80		
	Vere the instructor's lectures well prepared vid the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	4	6	2	7		1524/1560		4.55	4.72	4.67	3.50
	oid the instructor seem interested in the subjectors lecture material presented and explained cle					0	3	4	6	4	2		1508/1549		4.18	4.31	4.25	2.89
		es contribute to			2 1	1	3	3	7	2	4		1471/1546		4.24	4.32		3.05
				our understanding	1	12	5	1	0	0	2		1293/1323		3.73	4.00	3.99	2.13
		1	2										,					
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	3	0	5	4	3	3	3	2.72	1318/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	2.72
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	3	0	5	1	4	5	3	3.00	1297/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.00
				d open discussion	3	0	4	2	6	2	4	3.00	1304/1378		3.88	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		3	14	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	***
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7																	
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	-major	21
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

18

I

0

1

Course-Section: STAT 350 0202 University of Maryland Page 1613
Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 29
Ouestionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 0 7 3 3 3.33 1583/1670 3.64 4.13 4.31 4.24 3.33 0 0 1 2 6 3 3 3.33 1564/1666 3.76 4.11 4.27 4.18 3.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 3 5 4  $3.67 \ 1235/1406$  3.91 4.18 4.32 4.22 3.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 2 4 4 2  $3.50 \ 1448/1615$  3.65 4.17 4.24 4.18 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 4 1 3 2 3 2.92 1506/1566 3.31 3.90 4.07 4.04 2.92 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2 4 2 2 3.00 1447/1528 3.45 4.12 4.07 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 3 5 2 5 3.60 1430/1650 3.99 4.23 4.22 4.12 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1667 4.87 4.66 4.67 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 3 4 3 1 3.00 1534/1626 3.45 3.92 4.11 4.06 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 3 1 11 4.53 858/1559 4.31 4.50 4.46 4.40 4.53 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 7 6 4.20 1427/1560 4.10 4.55 4.72 4.67 4.20 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 2 5 4 3 3.40 1431/1549 3.70 4.18 4.31 4.25 3.40 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 5 2 5 3.53 1371/1546 3.84 4.24 4.32 4.24 3.53 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 9 0 2 0 1 1 3.25 1125/1323 2.76 3.73 4.00 3.99 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 1 1 1.91 1372/1384 2.45 3.72 4.10 4.12 1.91 0 2 2 0 2.00 1368/1378 2.63 3.76 4.29 4.30 2.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 2 1 3 1.287/1378 2.75 3.88 4.31 4.33 3.204. Were special techniques successful 5 8 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 904 1.33 3.28 4.03 4.03 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				2	0						

T 350 0301 University of Maryland

STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 18

Title

# Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1614 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	996/1670	3.64	4 13	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	622/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	799/1406		4.18	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	2	3	4	2		1436/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	771/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1097/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	705/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	909/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	371/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	673/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	673/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	610/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	495/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1143/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	1	2	1	2	2.45	1341/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	2.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1275/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	1304/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	***	***	4.47	4.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	***	4.00	4.54	2.63	***

STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 18

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1614 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

AI 350 U3U2 UNIVE

STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 12

Title

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1615 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1216/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	516/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	423/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	990/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4	1	3.36	1362/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1245/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	705/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1097/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	403/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	248/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	586/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	520/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1284/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.33
Discussion	_		_		_	_			40004					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	2	0			1375/1384		3.72	4.10	4.12	1.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	4	2	1	0		1367/1378	2.63		4.29	4.30	2.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	4	2	1	0		1361/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	2.10
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	897/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	1.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 232	****	5.00	1 10	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****		4.19		***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 230	****	5.00 5.00	4.21 4.44	3.99 4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	5.00			****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 218	****	5.00	4.31 4.18	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	тт	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 210		5.00	4.10	3.93	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	***

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1615 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Title

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 22

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1616 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				equer					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	643/1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	301/1666	3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	363/1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	446/1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	389/1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	421/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	361/1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1295/1667	4.49		4.67	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	278/1626	3.81	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	435/1559	4.04		4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	725/1560	4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	220/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	288/1546	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	692/1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	712/1384	4.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	774/1378	3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	653/1378	4.07	3.88		4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	461/ 904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 75	***	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21 21	0	0	0	0 1	1	0	4.00	****/ 79 ****/ 80	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	***/ 80		5.00	3.97	3.76	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101 Title

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1616 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Title Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1617 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructo: Ra:		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
			 Genera	1																
1. Di	d vou	gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	578/	1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.59
	_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	312/		3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.75
			estions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	212/	1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.88
4. Dia	d oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	3	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	660/	1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Dia	d ass:	igned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	559/	1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Dia	d writ	tten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learne	d 1	5	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	391/	1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.55
			g system clearl		ined	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	570/	1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.50
	-		was class canc			0	0	1	0	2	9	5		1524/		4.49	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. Hov	w wou.	ld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectivenes	s 4	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	316/	1626	3.81	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.62
			Lectur	e																
1. We	re the	e instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	221/	1559	4.04	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.93
			ctor seem inter		-	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	725/		4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.86
					xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67			4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.67
			es contribute t			2	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53			3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.53
5. Did	d aud:	iovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	8	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1264/	1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.60
			Discus																	
					what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	415/			3.72	4.10	4.12	4.54
					d to participate	4	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	943/		3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.08
		l the instructor encourage fair and open discuss e special techniques successful			d open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	768/		4.07	3.88	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Wei	re spe	ecial te	echniques succe	sstul		4	8	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	864/	904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	2.60
	Laboratory																			
		the lab increase understanding of the material				14	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
			rovided with adequate background informat			n 16 16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00			****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
			_	r provide assistance lab reports clearly specified			0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Wei	re re	quiremen	its for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
		_	Field																	
					hat you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Dio	d you	clearly	v understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
			Self																	
		_	-		what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
			ions make clea			15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50			****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
			acts with the i			15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
			ck/tutoring by	_	-	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		0	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Wei	re tne	ere enou	igh proctors fo	r all t	ne students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****
	F				Fre	quency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credi	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra				Expected Grade	S			Rea	asons					Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	 ior	 s	0	Gra	 duate	 e	0	 Мајо	 or	0	
28-55																		-		
56-83					Ge	nera	1				0	Und	er-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17		
84-15																-				
Grad	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	###	# - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh	
	P 0																			
			P 0 I 0					her				1		res	ponse	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	

0

11. SIAI 331 0201

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO ROY, ATUL

Instructor: ROY,
Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 18

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1618 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equen	cies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			- 											
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	1	8	3	3.22	1599/1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	6	2		1595/1666	3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	5	6	4		1294/1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	7	4	3		1536/1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	2	4	4		1478/1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	3	6	2		1464/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	5	8	2		1472/1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5			958/1667	4.49		4.67	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	5	2	6	0	2		1597/1626		3.92		4.06	2.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	4	5	2	O	U	_	2.4/	1397/1020	3.01	3.94	4.11	4.00	2.4/
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	3	4	4	2	2 72	1533/1559	4.04	4.50	4.46	4.40	2.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	6	5	3		1533/1560	4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	3.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	4	4	3		1500/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	3	3	3			1522/1546	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	7	1	3	2	2		1279/1323		3.73			2.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	/	1	3	2	2	2.40	12/9/1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	940/1384	4.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	5	1	7		1145/1378	3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	4	4	7		1023/1378	4.07	3.88		4.33	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	U	U	4	Τ.	_	4.00	401/ 904	3.33	3.20	4.03	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	TO		U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 210		5.00	4.10	3.93	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
J. Here erreeria for grading made orear		_	Ü	O	Ü	-	O	1.00	, 66		3.00	3.77	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
1. 11. Sometimes mer jou early out richa accivition	0	_	,	-	-	_	J	1.00	, 51			/		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****
<u> </u>														

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor: ROY, ATUL

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1618 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0202 Title

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

ROY, ATUL Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1619 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	7	1	3.24	1598/1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	4	3	3.35	1558/1666	3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1226/1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1411/1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	6	3	4	3.64	1210/1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	3	2	5		1261/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	6	3	3.44	1490/1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667		4.66	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1384/1626	3.81	3.92	4.11	4.06	3.50
Lecture		_	_	_		_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	5	3		1423/1559	4.04	4.50	4.46	4.40	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	4	2	5		1490/1560	4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	4	3	3		1389/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0 5	1	0	3	4	3		1305/1546	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	857/1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	696/1384	4.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1125/1378	3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1205/1378	4.07	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
_ ,														
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	•	_	-	F 00		als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 65	4 20	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79 ****/ 80	****		4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	U	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	^ ^ * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	1						

INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Title PARK, JUNYONG

Instructor: Enrollment: 30 Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1620 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	11	Student C	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnaries.		Deddelle e	CULDC	DValaacion	Queberonnarie

					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did vou gain new	insights, skills from the	is course	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1071/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.18
	or make clear the expecte		1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	908/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.30
	stions reflect the expect	-	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	352/1406	4.61	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.73
_	tions reflect the expecte	-	0	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	874/1615	4.18	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.25
	dings contribute to what	-	1	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1406/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.25
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute to wha	at you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.43
7. Was the grading	system clearly explained		1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	973/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	842/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.82
9. How would you gra	ade the overall teaching	effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	670/1626	3.97	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.30
	Lecture															
	tor's lectures well prepa		0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	276/1559	4.76	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.91
	or seem interested in the	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.82
	rial presented and expla	_	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.41	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.80
	contribute to what you		0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.36	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your	understanding	0	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1323	3.25	3.73	4.00	3.99	****
	Discussion		_		_		_									
	sions contribute to what	-	1	0	2	0	5	0	3		1216/1384		3.72	4.10	4.12	3.20
	s actively encouraged to		1	0	1	1	3	3	2		1228/1378		3.76	4.29	4.30	3.40
	or encourage fair and ope	en discussion	1	0	1	1	5	0	3		1266/1378		3.88	4.31	4.33	3.30
4. Were special tech	hniques successful		1	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	****
	Laboratory															
	ease understanding of the		9	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
	d with adequate backgroun		10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
_	aterials available for la		10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
	ructor provide assistance		10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirement	s for lab reports clearly	y specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field experi	ence contribute to what	you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly	understand your evaluation	on criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced s	ystem contribute to what	you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
<ol><li>Did study questi</li></ol>	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contact	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough	h proctors for all the st	tudents	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Ex	xpected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 15

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1621 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	luation	Questi	.onnair	е
---------	--------	------	---------	--------	---------	---

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	4 20	1060/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	686/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	423/1406	4.61	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	552/1615		4.17	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	2	2	4		1108/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	706/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	690/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	970/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	831/1626	3.97	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	339/1559	4.76	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	699/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	646/1549	4.41	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	768/1546		4.24	4.32	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.25	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion		_			_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	3	2	2		1321/1384			4.10	4.12	2.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	1	3	2	3		1319/1378		3.76	4.29	4.30	2.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	3 2	0 7	2 1	1	3 2	2 1	4		1225/1378	3.64 3.69	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	2	/	1	U	2	Т	2	3.50	718/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****
_														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant		

I 0 Other 15 ? 1

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301 University of Maryland
Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT Baltimore County
Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1622
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	29				
Questionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions				MD	377		_	ncies	5	_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question 	s 		NR 	NA 	1	2	3 	- 4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1216/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	967/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.25
		estions reflec			0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	597/1406	4.61	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.50
		ations reflect			0	1	1	0	2	4	4		1234/1615	4.18	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.91
				what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	790/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.10
				what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	4		1152/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.75
		g system clearl		ıned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	272/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.75
	-	was class canc			0	0	0 2	0	0	0	12		1/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overa	II teaci	ning effectiveness	0	0	2	U	3	5	2	3.42	1432/1626	3.97	3.92	4.11	4.06	3.42
	_	Lectur	_	_														
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	1	1	1	9		896/1559		4.50	4.46	4.40	4.50
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	1	0	3	8		1248/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.50
				xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2			1146/1549	4.41		4.31	4.25	4.00
		es contribute t	-		0	0 3	1 1	1	1	3	6		1139/1546		4.24	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did aud	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					3	Τ	U	6	U	2	3.22	1135/1323	3.25	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.22
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	1		1070/1384		3.72	4.10	4.12	3.57
				d to participate	5	0	1	1	2	0	3		1221/1378	3.32	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.43
				d open discussion	5 5	0 4	1	0	2	0 1	4		1070/1378	3.64	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiui		5	4	U	U	2	1	0	3.33	779/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	3.33
		Labora																
		rease understa			11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		5.00	4.19	4.04	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	cance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					Red	anir		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	 Majo	 r	0
28-55							\			.,01,	-	-	or addac	-	-		_	Ŭ
56-83						Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	12
84-150	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0												5				J -	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0				Electives 0				0 #### - Means there are not			enoug	h					
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	1						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0302 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

INTRO APP PROB & STAT Balt
ABERCROMBIE, MA S

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 16

Instructor:

Spring 2008

Page 1623

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Comman	Errolination	Ougstionnoine
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				_	ncies				tructor		_	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	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	996/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	821/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	535/1406	4.61			4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	5		1050/1615		4.17	4.24	4.18	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	3	5		1144/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	742/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	831/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	2	6	4.00						4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	521/1559	4.76	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	5	10		1302/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.40	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	9		924/1549	4.41	4.18	4.72	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	3	-		1117/1546				4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	7	2	3		1025/1323					3.54
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		2	U		,	2	J	3.31	1023/1323	3.23	3.73	1.00	3.99	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	2	5	3	3.38	1149/1384	3.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1181/1378	3.32	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	977/1378	3.64	3.88	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	373/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 239	****	5.00	4.19	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	13	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 210		3.00	4.10	3.93	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Frequ	iena:	, Die	trih	utio	n									
ttedr	«СПС Ў	מדמ	CTID	ucio.	11									
				_					_					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14

Course-Section: STAT 418 0101 University of Maryland Page 1624 AUG 6, 2008 Title APPL MULTIVARIATE METH Baltimore County

Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							L T 4	=que	TICTES	•		TIID	LIUCLOI	Course	Debr	OMPC	пелет	Sect
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1493/1666	3.56	4.11	4.27	4.35	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						4	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.18	4.32	4.48	4.40
4. Did otl	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1312/1615	3.78	4.17	4.24	4.37	3.78
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	3.90	4.07	4.17	3.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1063/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.26	3.88
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.66	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1254/1626	3.75	3.92	4.11	4.28	3.75
		Lectur	_															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		nrenared	1	0	1	0	2	0	5	4 00	1280/1559	4.00	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.00
					1	0	0	1	1	1			1411/1560		4.55	4.72	4.80	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					1	0	1	1	0	5			1389/1549		4.18	4.31		3.50
		es contribute t			1	0	1	0	2	4			1379/1546		4.24		4.43	
					1	0	0	0	1	2			326/1323			4.00	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						U	U	U	1	2	J	4.50	320/1323	4.50	3.73	1.00	4.10	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	608/1384	4.33	3.72	4.10	4.32	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	797/1378	4.33	3.76	4.29	4.55	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	813/1378	4.33	3.88	4.31	4.60	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful				6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	***	
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Тъл	ne	Majors			
						keasons							Туре 					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	Graduate 2		Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		General						4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Electives Other					0			#### - Means there are not				jh
				P 0									responses to be significant					
				Ι 0								4						

? 0

Title STATISTICAL COMPUTING

Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1625 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			Tnst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	531/1670	4.63	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1666	4.03	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1406	****	4.11	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	290/1615		4.17	4.24	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	0	4		1059/1566		3.90	4.07	4.17	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1528	4.86	4.12	4.12	4.26	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	757/1650		4.23	4.22	4.28	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667		4.66	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	2			4.00	3.92	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.55	4.72	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.18	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.24	4.32	4.43	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	545/1323	4.25	3.73	4.00	4.10	4.25
Discussion	_					_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384		3.72	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.76	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	3.88	4.31	4.60	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	***	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: STAT 433 0101 Title

STATISTICAL COMPUTING

Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1625 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: STAT 453 0101 University of Maryland Page 1626 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Enrollment: 18 Ouestionnaires: 14

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		General	 L															
1. Did you	u gain new	insights,skil	lls from	this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.43
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.43
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	775/1406	4.36	4.18	4.32	4.48	4.36
4. Did oth	her evalua	tions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	737/1615	4.36	4.17	4.24	4.37	4.36
5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	3	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.90	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did wri	itten assi	gnments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.12	4.12	4.26	4.25
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	/ explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.86	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.86
8. How mar	ny times w	as class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.66	4.67	4.73	4.50
9. How wou	uld you gr	ade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1365/1626	3.56	3.92	4.11	4.28	3.56
1. Were th	he instruc	tor's lectures	repared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.71	
		the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1188/1560	4.57	4.55	4.72	4.80	4.57		
				plained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1218/1549	3.93	4.18	4.31	4.43	3.93
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute to	what y	ou learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.24	4.32	4.43	4.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	1	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.10	****
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			hat you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	670/1384	4.25	3.72	4.10	4.32	4.25
				to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	1		894/1378		3.76	4.29	4.55	4.20
				open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	1		1110/1378		3.88	4.31	4.60	3.75
		hniques succes			10	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	1									
	- 1																	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	3			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduate	:	0	Majo	r	6
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2							-			-						3 -		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 4						Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-gr	ad 1	.4	Non-	major	8
84-150	D 1																	

Electives

Other

1

8

#### Course-Section: STAT 470 0101 University of Maryland Page 1627 AUG 6, 2008 Title PROB ACTUARIAL SCIENCE Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.38
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1114/1666	4.13	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.13
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.18	4.32	4.48	4.25
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	972/1615	4.17	4.17	4.24	4.37	4.17
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.12	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	1	0	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	1624/1650	2.50	4.23	4.22	4.28	2.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.66	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	3.92	4.11	4.28	4.60
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well ]	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.71
2. Did the	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.18	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.24	4.32	4.43	4.57
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.10	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.72	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	****	3.76	4.29	4.55	****
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1378	****	3.88	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	าแรก	ed f	or Ma	iors	. – – –	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2					1000	2u11	cu I	O1 140		,	J	Graduat	_		1.101	/ <b>_</b>	U
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	9
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					GCI	iici a	_				5	onder 9	Luu	_	14011	101	
Grad.					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enono	rh	
	-		=	P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Otl	her					4			3		-	
1 0 Other																		

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101

APPLIED STATISTICS II

Title Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS

Enrollment:

Page 1628

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Ouestionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 440/1670 4.69 4.13 4.31 4.46 4.69 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 582/1666 4.54 4.11 4.27 4.34 4.54 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 2 8 4.38 739/1406 4.38 4.18 4.32 4.36 4.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 1 0 1 2 5 4.11 1018/1615 4.11 4.17 4.24 4.33 4.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.08 808/1566 4.08 3.90 4.07 4.20 4.08 0 0 2 10 4.83 157/1528 4.83 4.12 4.12 4.33 4.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 806/1650 4.33 4.23 4.22 4.30 4.33 0 0 0 0 10 3 4.23 1381/1667 4.23 4.66 4.67 4.74 4.23 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 7 4 4.36 605/1626 4.36 3.92 4.11 4.20 4.36Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 221/1559 4.92 4.50 4.46 4.49 4.92 0 0 2 11 4.85 751/1560 4.85 4.55 4.72 4.81 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 451/1549 4.69 4.18 4.31 4.37 4.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 582/1546 4.62 4.24 4.32 4.40 4.62 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/1323 **** 3.73 4.00 4.03 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 3 3 0 3 3.00 1260/1384 3.00 3.72 4.10 4.21 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 3 3.89 1064/1378 3.89 3.76 4.29 4.42 3.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  $6 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 2 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4.14 \ 926/1378 \ 4.14 \ 3.88 \ 4.31 \ 4.51 \ 4.14$ 4. Were special techniques successful 4 7 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 904 **** 3.28 4.03 4.04 **** Laboratory 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 232 **** 5.00 4.19 4.30 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 239 **** 5.00 4.21 4.53 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 230 **** 5.00 4.44 4.69 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 1 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 5.00 4.31 4.58 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 218 **** 5.00 4.18 4.47 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 1 3.00 ****/ 87 **** **** 4.65 4.61 **** 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.64 4.67 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** / 75 **** *** 4.57 4.66 **** 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  $11 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 3.50 \ **** \ 79 \ **** \ **** \ 4.45 \ 4.58 \ ****$ 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 11 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 3.97 4.32 **** Field Work 12 0 0 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 4.65 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 12 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.62 4.65 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.27 4.59 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.47 4.59 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.64 4.82 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 16 *** 4.00 4.67 4.60 ****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 27 *** 4.00 4.54 4.67 ***

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 10 *** 5.00 4.84 4.90 ***

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 12 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 6 *** 5.00 4.92 5.00 ****

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101

APPLIED STATISTICS II

Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1628 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 607 0101 University of Maryland
Title BAYESIAN INFERENCE Baltimore County
Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

7

University of Maryland Page 1629
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse!	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------	--------	------------	---------------

	Overtions				Fre	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam ques	tions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluat	ions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned read	lings contribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assig	nments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading s	. Was the grading system clearly explained  How many times was class cancelled				0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times wa	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.67
9. How would you gra	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.67	
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructo	r seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture mater	ial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.18	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures	contribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual t	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00
	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n											
Credits Earned				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors			

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

University of Maryland Course-Section: STAT 612 0101 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT II

Baltimore County Spring 2008

SINHA, BIMAL Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Page 1630 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

_				
Ctudent	COURCA	Evaluation	Ougetionnai	ira
bludent	COULSE	E varuation	Ouescionna	$_{\text{L}}$

Quanting			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	355/1666			4.27	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	339/1566	4.60	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1528	4.86	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1032/1650	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6		424/1549	4.71	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	457/1546	4.71	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378	****	3.76	4.29	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378	****	3.88	4.31	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03		***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	***
_		- <b>5</b> .2	.,											

# Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 621 0101 University of Maryland Title PROB THRY/STOCH PROC I Instructor:

Page 1631 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029 RATHINAM, MURUH

Enrollment:	9			_		
Ouestionnaires:	8	Student	Course	Eval	luation	Ouestionnaire

Questions				MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Quescion	- 															
		General	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	529/1666	4.57	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.57
3. Did the	e exam qı	estions reflect	t the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	691/1406	4.43	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	5.00
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	5		1/1528	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	5.00
		g system clearly		ned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6		1/1650		4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	3			1104/1667	4.57	4.66	4.67		4.57
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	403/1626	4.50	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.50
	Lecture  1 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared									_	_							
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67			4.50	4.46	4.49	4.67
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>					0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.83
					2	0	0	0	1	2		4.33		4.33	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.33
		es contribute to	_		2	0	0	0	1	1		4.50	-,		4.24	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisua.	l techniques en	nance yo	ur understanding	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.03	****
		Discus																
1 54 -1.				hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/120/	++++	3.72	1 10	4 01	****
				to participate	7	-	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384 ****/1378	****	3.72	4.10	4.21	****
				open discussion	7	-	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378		3.88	4.29	4.51	***
3. DIG CIR	e Instiu	ctor encourage .	Laii anu	Open discussion	,	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	/13/6		3.00	4.31	4.51	
				Frequ	ency	n Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00.27	2	0 00 0 00							or Ma			0	Graduat		1	Majo		0
28-55	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1					Red	Juir	ea r	JI Mc	LJOES	j.	U	Graduati	E	1	Мајс	)L	U
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Cor	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad	7	Non	-major	8
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0				Gel	лета.	T				U	onder -g.	Lau	,	NOII-	ilia JUI	O	
	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					E14	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enoud	h
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					111	CCL	v CD			<pre>0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>								
I O					0+1	ner					1	1 CDPOHB		c bign				
	3 O					001						_						

Course-Section: STAT 653 0101

BASIC MATH STAT

Title CHOI, TAERYON Instructor:

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1632 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	556/1666	4.33	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	667/1406		4.18	4.32	4.36	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	660/1615	4.43	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	324/1566	4.63	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	-	4.63	330/1528	4.63	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	728/1626	4.25		4.11	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1323	4.86	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	434/1384	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	481/1378	4.67	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	3.88	4.31		4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	3.28	4.03	4.04	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	5.00	****

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1632 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 700A 0101 University of Maryland SURVEY SAMPLING Baltimore County Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA

Spring 2008

Enrollment: 12

Title

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1633 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera																
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1670	4.89	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.89
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	719/1666	4.44	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.44
	_	estions reflec		_	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.25
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.38	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.38
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.33
				o what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	590/1528	4.38	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.38
		system clearl		ined	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	867/1650	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.29
	-	was class canc			0	0 1	0	0	0	1 1	8	4.89	712/1667	4.89	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.89
9. How wor	ila you g	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	2	Τ	U	U	0	Τ	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.83
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well :	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	220/1549	4.89	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.89
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.78	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.78
5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.03	****
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.72	4.10	4.21	****
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1378	****	3.76	4.29	4.42	****
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378	****	3.88	4.31	4.51	****
		chniques succe			8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.04	****
		Labora	-				_	_	_	_								
		rease understa	_		8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.30	****
_	_	_		ground information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	****
				or lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.69	****
		tructor provid		tance early specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231 ****/ 218	****	5.00 5.00	4.31 4.18	4.58 4.47	****
5. were re	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts ci	early specified	8	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	~~~/ 218		5.00	4.18	4.4/	
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı											
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reaso								3			Туј	pe.			Majors	
										- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99						ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	е	8	Majo	r	9
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B 2 C 0	General							6	Undor ~	rad	1	Non	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0	General							U	Under-g	Lau	т	NOI1-	ına Jor	U
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Fleatives						2	#### _ 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh	
Grau.	0	3.30-4.00	1	P 0	Electives					4	#### - Means t				_	111		
				I O	Other					0	responses to be significant							

? 0

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101 University of Maryla Title MODELING/SPATIAL STATS Baltimore County Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR (Instr. A) Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1634
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		t 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	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1594/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1461/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1248/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1526/1549	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1442/1546	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.81	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1		603/1378		3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1		653/1378		3.88	4.31	4.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904		3.28	4.03	4.04	
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	d Grades Re						Ty		Ty	pe			Majors	

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

University of Maryland MODELING/SPATIAL STATS Baltimore County

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101 Page 1635 AUG 6, 2008 Title Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	4	

Questionnaires:	4		Student	Course	Evalı	uatio	on Qu	ıesti	onna	aire		
						Fre	equer	ncies	:		Instr	ructor
	Ouestio	ons		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank

								_			21 40001	COULDO	DOPO	01120		2000
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam ques			0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluat		=	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignment	gnments contribute	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading s	system clearly exp	lained -	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you gra	ade the overall te	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1254/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct		l prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	896/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81
3. Was lecture mater			0	0	0	0	0	2	2		683/1549	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures	-	-	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	987/1546	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.06
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	692/1323	3.81	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.81
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students		-	2	0	0	0	0	1	1		603/1378	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructo	_		2	0	0	0	0	1	1		653/1378	4.50	3.88	4.31		4.50
4. Were special tech	_	_	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904	1.50	3.28	4.03		1.50
Freq				, Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									
		11040														
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Tyr	oe .			Majors	

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

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101 University of Maryland
Title MODELING/SPATIAL STATS Baltimore County
Instructor: (Instr. C) Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1636
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4				
Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t 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	1	4 00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0	0	0	1	2	1	0		1603/1666	3.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	0		1343/1406		4.11	4.32	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	-	-	0	-	_	-	0			3.00	4.18		4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0		1083/1615	4.00		4.24		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	•	Τ	1	1	0		1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	4.00	,	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	0		1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	0		1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	Τ	1	2	0	3.25	1491/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	896/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2		1146/1549	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	987/1546	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	3.81	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.81
J. Did addiovibual ecciniques ciniance your understanding	U	_	U	U	_	_	_	1.00	0,2,1,2,5	3.01	3.73	1.00	1.03	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904	1.50	3.28	4.03	4.04	1.50
•														
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

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

University of Maryland MODELING/SPATIAL STATS Baltimore County

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101 Page 1637 AUG 6, 2008 Title Instructor: (Instr. D) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	4	
0	1	

Ouestionnaires:	4	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questions

General

		Genera	T																
1. Did you	ı gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	3.00	
4. Did oth	ner eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.00	
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00	
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00	
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00	
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00	
9. How wou	ıld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44	
		Lecture	٩																
1. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25	
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81	
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	,	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81	
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	715/1546	4.06		4.32	4.40	4.06	
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25			3.73		4.03	3.81	
		1		3									,						
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00	
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.50	
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904	1.50	3.28	4.03	4.04	1.50	
				_															
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribi	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Тур	e			Majors	;	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 1		Red	 guire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 S	0	 Graduate	·	3	Majo	 or	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			-			-						,			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-gr	ad	1	Non-	-major	4	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoue	јh	
				Р 0									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0		Oth	ner					4							

Course-Section: STAT 710A 0101 Title ADVANCED INFERENCE Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL

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

Page 1638

Enrollment:	4				
Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	0 £	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650		4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.18	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.76	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.88	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.28	4.03	4.04	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background informatio	n 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.53	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.69	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.58	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.00
Fre	quency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	5			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Re	 quir	 ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 r	4

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

Course-Section: STAT 710B 0101 Title RELIABILITY Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 1639 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did othe 5. Did assi 5. Did writ 7. Was the 8. How many 9. How woul	instruct exam que er evalua igned rea tten ass: grading y times v	system clearly	lls from the expe t the expe the expe ute to wh	ected goals pected goals ected goals	0 0 0	0	0											
2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did othe 5. Did assi 5. Did writ 7. Was the 8. How many 9. How woul	instruct exam que er evalua igned rea tten ass: grading y times v	tor make clear estions reflect ations reflect adings contribution ignments contributions system clearly	the expe t the exp the expe ute to wh	ected goals pected goals ected goals	0		0	_										
3. Did the 4. Did othe 5. Did assi 5. Did writ 7. Was the 8. How many 9. How woul	exam que er evaluatigned reatten assigned grading	estions reflect ations reflect adings contribution ignments contributions system clearly	t the exp the expo ute to wh	pected goals ected goals		0		0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.75
1. Did other 5. Did assi 5. Did writ 7. Was the 8. How many 9. How woul	er evaluatigned reatten assigneding	ations reflect adings contribu ignments contri system clearly	the expe	ected goals	0		0	0	1	0	3	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.50
5. Did assi 5. Did writ 7. Was the 8. How many 9. How woul	igned reatten assigned grading y times w	adings contrib ignments contri system clearly	ute to wh			3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	5.00
5. Did writ 7. Was the 8. How many 9. How woul	tten ass: grading y times w	ignments contri system clearly			0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.0
7. Was the 3. How many 9. How woul	grading y times w	system clearly	ibute to	nat you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.5
B. How many B. How woul	y times v			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.7
. How woul	_			ned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.6
	ld you g	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2			1157/1667			4.67		
Were the		rade the overa	ll teachi	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.50
Were the		Lecture	е															
		ctor's lecture:	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.7
		tor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	683/1549	4.50		4.31	4.37	
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546		4.24	4.32	4.40	
. Did audi	iovisual	techniques enl	hance you	ur understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	481/1323	4.33	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.3
		Discus																
				nat you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1384			4.10	4.21	5.0
				to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378		3.76	4.29	4.42	5.0
. Did the	instruct	tor encourage :	fair and	open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.88	4.31	4.51	5.0
		Labora	-															
				round information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21		5.0
	_			r lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.69	5.0
. Were red	quirement	ts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.0
		Semina																
. Were cri	iteria fo	or grading made	e clear		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	3.97	4.32	5.0
	_	Self 1			_		_											
				nat you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.0
		ions make clear	_		3	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	13/ 16			4.67	4.60	4.0
_		cts with the in		_	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 27		4.00	4.54	4.67	
		k/tutoring by p	-	_	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10		5.00	4.84	4.90	
. Were the	ere enoug	gh proctors for	r all the	e students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.92	5.00	5.0
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re		ed f	 or Ma	ior	 3	 2	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0						. ,,	-			-	-	- 100 ) 0	•	•
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						