Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

MARFANI, ERUM F

Instructor:

Enrollment: 80 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1527

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions					Fre	anie	ncie	S		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	IIMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings system clearly explained clearly resemble system clearly reading system clearly reading system clearly reading system clearly reading reading system clearly reading		Questions	NR	NA					5				_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings system clearly explained clearly readings system clearly presented and explained clearly readings system clearly presented and explained clearly readings system clearly presented and explained clearly readings readings readings system clearly presented and explained clearly readings																
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class camenlad 8. How the many times was class camenlad 8. How the many times was class camenlad 8. How the instructor was camenlad 8. How the many times was class camenlad 8. How the many times was class camenlad 8. How the many time		General														
3. bid the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1. Did you	gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	8	19	31	4.34	861/1576	4.23	4.25	4.30	4.11	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did sasigned reading system clearly explained 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 24 25 4.42 1177/1574 4.66 4.64 4.59 4.42 1.0 4.68 12. Were the instructor's learning swell purspared 1. Were the instructor's learning swell purspared 1. Were the instructor's learning swell purspared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the learning swell purspared 4. Did the learning swell purspared 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0. 2. 1. 3. 5. 2. 4.33 784/1270 4.20 3.34 4.17 3.96 3.91 2. Were special techniques auccessful 2. Eaboratory 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques auccessful 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Mere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were assigned techniques accessful 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were you provided with adequate background information 5. Were you clearly specified 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Were assigned techniques accessful 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the materi	2. Did the	instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	11	42	4.61	462/1576	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.18	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16. O 0 0 1 0 3 9 46 4.68 327/1547 4.59 4.18 4.19 4.10 4.68 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16. O 0 0 0 1 4.26 712/1554 4.24 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.26 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Diagnation 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Were provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4. Did the lab instructor revoide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4. Did the lab instructor variable for individual attention 5. Were recessary materials available for individual attention 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4. Did the lab instructor variable for individual attention 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4. Did the lab instructor variable for individual attention 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Were contribute to what you learned 5. O 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 79 *** 5.00 4.59 4.52 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6. Did sold experience contribute to what you learned 7. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 79 *** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did conferences help you carry out field activit	3. Did the	exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	48	4.75	310/1342	4.75	4.34	4.32	4.19	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did away times was class cancelled 0 0 1 2 3 0 0 1 2 2 0 8.3 18/14/34 4.65 4.15 4.14 4.94 4.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 0 2 4 4.68 18/14/14 4.65 4.18 4.19 4.10 4.68 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.68 18/14/14 4.65 4.64 4.94 4.99 4.42 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 0 6 20 17 4.26 712/1554 4.24 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.26 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 6 51 4.86 309/1488 4.80 4.56 4.47 4.41 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 9 46 4.68 309/1488 4.80 4.56 4.47 4.41 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 9 46 4.68 309/1488 4.80 4.56 4.47 4.41 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 9 46 4.68 309/1488 4.80 4.56 4.47 4.41 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 9 46 4.78 868/1493 4.81 4.69 4.73 4.65 4.78 4.64 4.64 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.78 4.7	4. Did other	er evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	0	3	0	7	24	4.53	487/1520	4.53	4.22	4.25	4.09	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Now many times was class cancelled 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 0 0 34 25 4.42 1177/1574 4.66 4.64 4.64 4.59 4.42 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 0 0 34 25 4.42 1177/1574 4.66 4.64 4.64 4.59 4.42 1. Eacture 1. Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion 6. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were special techniques successful 7. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were you provided with adequate background information 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 9. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9. Nere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9. Nere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Nere assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9. Were contextual to what you learned 9. Did greatent for grading made clear 9. Nere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Did greatent for grading made clear 9. Did greatent for grading made clear 9. Did greatent provide assistance 9. Did greatent provide greatent provide a			1	13	1	1	6	11	26	4.33	571/1465	4.25	3.89	4.12	4.02	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Now many times was class cancelled 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 17 4.26 712/1554 4.24 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.26 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 3 7 48 4.78 868/1493 4.81 4.69 4.73 4.65 4.78 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 3 7 48 4.78 868/1493 4.81 4.69 4.73 4.65 4.78 3. Was lecture active interested in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 14 1 6 10 24 4.31 489/1277 4.38 4.04 4.03 3.91 4.31 Discussion Discussio		-				0	1		2.0							
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 0 0 34 25 4.42 1177/1574 4.66 4.64 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.26 1. Were the instructor's lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 9. Did the linstructor seem interested in the subject 1. 0 0 1 1 3 9 45 4.69 437/1486 4.66 4.25 4.32 4.26 4.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. 0 0 1 1 7 50 4.80 322/1489 4.74 4.32 4.32 4.22 4.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 5 1 2 8 16 3.91 899/1279 4.00 3.34 4.17 3.96 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0 2 1 3 5 22 4.33 784/1270 4.20 3.32 4.35 4.09 4.33 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 28 0 1 3 4 5 18 4.16 870/1269 4.19 3.76 4.35 4.09 4.33 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 28 0 1 3 4 5 18 4.16 870/1269 4.19 3.76 4.35 4.09 4.33 3. Were reprovided with adequate background information 55 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 5.00 ***/ 280 ***. S.00 4.05 3.91 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 55 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 280 ***. S.00 4.05 4.29 4.27 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 280 ****. S.00 4.69 4.52 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 380 ****. S.00 4.61 4.55 ***** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly appendicus 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 40 *****. S.00 4.64 4.33 *** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 40 *****. ****. 4.0 4.11 **** 5. Did field experience contrib											, -					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 0 6 20 17 4.26 712/1554 4.24 4.04 4.10 4.01 4.26			-	0		-	_									
Lecture 1. Were the instructor 1. Decrease 1. Decr																
1. Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 1 4.86 309/1488 4.80 4.56 4.47 4.41 4.86		1 J		-	-	-	-				,					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 3 7 48 4.78 868/1493 4.81 4.69 4.73 4.65 4.78		Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were special techniques understanding of the material 8. Were special techniques understanding of the material 8. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Were proper provided with adequate background information 8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were expected topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what yo	1. Were the	e instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	51	4.86	309/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were special techniques understanding of the material 8. Were special techniques understanding of the material 8. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Were proper provided with adequate background information 8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were expected topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Were criteria for grading made clear 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what yo	2. Did the	instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	7	48	4.78	868/1493	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.65	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Discussion 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. O 5 1 2 8 16 3.91 899/1279 7. Did the lab instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Were your provided with adequate background information 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 9. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Were requirements contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5. O 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		-	1	0	0	1	3	9	45	4.69		4.66	4.25	4.32	4.26	4.69
Discussion Discus			0	0			1	7	50							
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 5 1 2 8 16 3.91 899/1279 4.00 3.34 4.17 3.96 3.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 38 0 1 3 4 5 18 4.16 870/1269 4.19 3.76 4.35 4.09 4.33 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 28 0 1 3 4 5 18 4.16 870/1269 4.19 3.76 4.35 4.09 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 26 21 2 1 0 3 6 3.83 ****/ 878 4.21 3.99 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 55 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 234 **** **** 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 5. Did dield experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 5. Did conference help you carry out field activities 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 58 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 5. Did sel			3													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 5 1 2 8 16 3.91 889/1279 4.00 3.34 4.17 3.96 3.91 2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0 2 1 3 5 52 4.33 784/1270 4.20 3.32 4.35 4.09 4.36 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 28 0 1 3 4 5 18 4.16 870/1269 4.19 3.76 4.35 4.09 4.16 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0											,					
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0 2 1 3 3 5 22 4.33 784/1270 4.20 3.32 4.35 4.09 4.33 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 28 0 1 3 4 5 18 4.16 870/1269 4.19 3.76 4.35 4.09 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 26 21 2 1 0 3 6 3.83 ***** 878 4.21 3.99 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 55 1 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 234 **** **** 4.23 4.08 **** 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 56 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 **** 24 4.34 **** **** 4.23 4.08 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 24 29 **** 5.00 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 232 **** 5.00 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 232 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 85 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 79 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 78 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 78 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.70 *		Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 5. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did sould clear the expected goal 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did sould clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contri	1. Did clas	ss discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	5	1	2	8	16	3.91	899/1279	4.00	3.34	4.17	3.96	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 5.00 4.51 4.43 **** 58 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 22 **** 5.00 4.59 4.52 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Were all	l students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	2	1	3	5	22	4.33	784/1270	4.20	3.32	4.35	4.09	4.33
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 5. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did self-paced system contribute the expected goal 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contri			28	0	1	3	4	5	18	4.16						4.16
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 55 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 234 **** **** 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 56 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.29 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 229 *** 5.00 4.35 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 232 *** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 ***** ****************************				21		1	0	3	6							****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 55 1 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 234 **** **** 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 56 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 **** 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.29 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 250 **** 5.00 4.35 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 232 **** 5.00 4.27 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 79 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 70 *** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 42 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 72 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 74 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 75 **** 4.44 4.41 1 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 75 **** 4.44 4.41 1 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 40 **** 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 40 **** 4.66 4.68 ****	-	•														
2. Were your provided with adequate background information 56 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.29 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 5.00 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 5.00 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did green for grading made clear 42 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.44 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.44 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.73 4.71 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.66 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.83 4.71 **** 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 ***** 4.66 4.68 ****		Laboratory														
2. Were your provided with adequate background information 56 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.29 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 5.00 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 5.00 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did green for grading made clear 42 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.44 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.44 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.73 4.71 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.66 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.83 4.71 **** 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 ***** 4.66 4.68 ****	1. Did the	lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 234	***	****	4.23	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 5.00 4.51 4.43 **** 4.01 dthe lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 5.00 4.51 4.43 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5.00 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 5.20 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00				0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	***	5.00	4.35		****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 5.00 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 1 0 0 0 15 2 4.12 204/ 379 4.09 3.90 4.20 4.15 4.12 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 **** 4. Simple for contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.67 4.68 **** 4. Simple for contacts with the instructor helpful 58 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0	0					****				****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme			56		0	0	0	0	2			****				****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 42 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.67 4.68 ****						0	0		2			4.09				4.12
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 42 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.73 4.71 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.66 4.68 ****											,					
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 42 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.67 4.68 ****		Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1. Were ass	signed topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2. Was the	instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	***	5.00	4.69	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 42 0 0 0 13 1 3 3.41 221/ 375 3.31 3.42 4.01 3.78 3.41 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 *** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****			57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****			57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****	_	-	42	0	0	0	13	1	3	3.41	221/ 375	3.31	3.42	4.01	3.78	3.41
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****																
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****		Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****	1. Did fiel	ld experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****	2. Did you	clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/ 326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****			57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.73	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43 0 0 0 13 1 2 3.31 202/326 3.31 3.12 4.03 3.64 3.31 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****			57						2			****	****			****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****					0	0	13			3.31	202/ 326	3.31	3.12			3.31
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****																
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****		Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****	1. Did seli	f-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
3. Well four concaces with the instructor neighbor 57 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 / 33	2. Did stud	dy questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
	3. Were you	ur contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****	4. Was the	feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 0 0 20 0 2 3.18 286/382 3.35 3.24 4.08 3.86 3.18			37	0	0	0	20	0	2	3.18	286/ 382	3.35	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.18

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor:

MARFANI, ERUM F

Enrollment:

80 Questionnaires: 59 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1527 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	18	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	11	General	3	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26	-			
				?	0						

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 146 Questionnaires: 107

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1528 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	8	16	39	44	4.11	1081/1576	4.23	4.25	4.30	4.11	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	24	75	4.63	448/1576	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	15	87	4.76	298/1342	4.75	4.34	4.32	4.19	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	38	0	0	8	17	44	4.52	487/1520	4.53	4.22	4.25	4.09	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	5	1	17	24	51	4.17	728/1465	4.25	3.89	4.12	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	55	1	1	4	11	33	4.48	423/1434	4.65	4.15	4.14	3.94	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	10	21	70	4.50	543/1547	4.59	4.18	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	8	96	4.90	488/1574	4.66	4.64	4.64	4.59	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	1	2	2	52	28	4.22	742/1554	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.01	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	20	82	4.74	526/1488	4.80	4.56	4.47	4.41	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	15	89	4.84	734/1493	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.65	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	25	74	4.63	530/1486	4.66	4.25	4.32	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	18	80	4.69	474/1489	4.74	4.32	4.32	4.22	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	1	3	11	16	62	4.45	356/1277	4.38	4.04	4.03	3.91	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	5	2	11	17	36	4.08	777/1279	4.00	3.34	4.17	3.96	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	4	3	11	19	33	4.06	915/1270	4.20	3.32	4.35	4.09	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	2	1	11	23	34	4.21	840/1269	4.19	3.76	4.35	4.09	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	37	36	1	0	5	13	15	4.21	395/ 878	4.21	3.99	4.05	3.91	4.21
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	95	4	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	98	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	99	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	99	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	72	5	0	0	0	28	2	4.07	216/ 379	4.09	3.90	4.20	4.15	4.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	99	4	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	101	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	101	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	101	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	74	4	0	0	26	0	3	3.21	254/ 375	3.31	3.42	4.01	3.78	3.21
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	101	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	102	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	101	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	101	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	72	3	0	0	25	4	3	3.31	202/ 326	3.31	3.12	4.03	3.64	3.31
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	94	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	94	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	,	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	94	6	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	,	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	6	0	0	25	5	7	3.51	217/ 382	3.35	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.51

Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S

Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E

Enrollment: 146
Questionnaires: 107

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1528 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	1	A	62	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	6	Under-grad	107	Non-major	107
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	23	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	47	_			
				?	1						

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 69 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1529 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eva.	luati	on (Duest:	ionna	aire

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1427/1576	4.18	4.25	4.30	4.30	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	9	7	17	4.15	1040/1576	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	7	20	4.24	850/1342	4.32	4.34	4.32	4.30	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	4	3	5	15	3.93	1128/1520	4.08	4.22	4.25	4.25	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	4	3	1	3	9	3.50	1242/1465	3.98	3.89	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	3	3	4	5	9		1178/1434		4.15	4.14	4.15	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	8	15		1103/1547		4.18	4.19	4.21	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1			141/1574		4.64	4.64	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	3	10	8			1340/1554		4.04	4.10		3.42
or now would for grade one everall conducting directiveness	Ü	ŭ	-			Ü	-	3.12	1310, 1331	1.05	1.01	1.10	1.05	3.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	6	23	4.48	895/1488	4.68	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	4	10	16		1387/1493	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	6	10	12		1218/1486		4.25	4.32		3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	9			1118/1489	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1		5	1	6	2			1176/1277		4.04		4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	5	Т	O	2	4	2.94	11/6/12//	3.00	4.04	4.03	4.11	2.94
Discussion														
	4	0	0	4	2	_	0	2 10	1172/1070	2 26	2 24	4 1 1	4 00	2 10
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	4	3	7	8		1173/1279	3.36	3.34	4.17	4.20	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	7	4	6	5	8		1200/1270	3.46	3.32	4.35	4.42	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	9	2	4	6	8		1208/1269	3.61	3.76	4.35	4.41	3.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	26	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	3.54	3.99	4.05	4.09	****
- 1 · ·														
Laboratory				_			•					4 0-	4 00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	218/ 379	4.03	3.90	4.20	4.17	4.06
Seminar							•						4 00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61		****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	15	0	2	3.11	279/ 375	3.06	3.42	4.01	4.12	3.11
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52		****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	10	1	1	3.08	248/ 326	3.19	3.12	4.03	4.23	3.08
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	1	0	7	0	1	3.00	313/ 382	3.32	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.00

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 69
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1529 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	-			
				?	0						

STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Title MARFANI, ERUM F

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 40

77

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1530 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	20116	ncie	g		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	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	7	9	24	4.43	757/1576		4.25	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	12	23	4.38	798/1576		4.26	4.27	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	11	23	4.41	696/1342		4.34	4.32	4.30	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	6	14	15	4.14	969/1520	4.08	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	3	7	7	18	4.14	758/1465		3.89	4.12	4.09	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	2	8	6	12		1063/1434		4.15	4.14	4.15	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	27	4.47	575/1547		4.18	4.19	4.21	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	281/1574		4.64	4.64	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	17	11	4.26	712/1554	4.09	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	32	4.79	442/1488	4.68	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	11	28	4.72	986/1493	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	12	22	4.44	778/1486	4.31	4.25	4.32	4.32	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	10	25	4.58	614/1489	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	2	5	5	19	4.32			4.04	4.03	4.11	4.32
Discussion	_	•	_	_									4 00	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	2	10	4	10		1147/1279	3.36	3.34	4.17	4.20	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	6	2	9	6	10		1163/1270	3.46	3.32	4.35	4.42	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	11	8	9		1104/1269	3.61	3.76	4.35	4.41	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	7	17	5	1	3	3	4	3.00	799/ 878	3.54	3.99	4.05	4.09	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	2	0	0	0	6	1		****/ 379	4.03	3.90	4.20	4.17	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports creatify specifical	31	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ū	-		, 3,,,	1.05	3.70	1.20	1.1/	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	***	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	***	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	***	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	****/ 375	3.06	3.42	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	2	0	0	7	0			****/ 326	3.19	3.12	4.03	4.23	****
		_	-	-	•	-	_		, , , , ,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	8	1	3	3.58	210/ 382	3.32	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.58

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 40

STAT W/APP IN BIOL SC: MARFANI, ERUM F

Enrollment:

77

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1530 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34	-			
				?	2						

Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI

MARFANI, ERUM F Instructor:

Enrollment:

52 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1531 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		:	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sec Mea
		 General																
1. Did you	ı qain ne	w insights, skil	ls from this course		0	0	0	0	4	6	21	4.55	582/1576	4.18	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.5
_	_	-	the expected goals		0	0	0	0	5	6	20	4.48	638/1576	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.4
			the expected goals		0	0	0	1	5	8	17	4.32	779/1342	4.32	4.34	4.32	4.30	4.3
			the expected goals		1	1	0	2	6	6	15	4.17	937/1520	4.08	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.1
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	te to what you learr	ned	1	3	0	2	3	7	15	4.30	606/1465	3.98	3.89	4.12	4.09	4.3
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	oute to what you lea	arned	0	8	1	2	2	9	9	4.00	878/1434	3.79	4.15	4.14	4.15	4.0
7. Was the	e gradino	system clearly	explained		0	0	1	1	4	6	19	4.32	765/1547	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.3
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	lled		1	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	606/1574	4.92	4.64	4.64	4.61	4.8
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teaching effective	eness	4	1	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	339/1554	4.09	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.5
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	484/1488		4.56	4.47	4.47	4.7
			2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	829/1493	4.55	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.7		
	oid the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained cle					0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	514/1486	4.31	4.25	4.32	4.32	4.6
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	539/1489		4.32	4.32		
5. Did aud	pid audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					8	5	1	1	3	12	3.73	909/1277	3.66	4.04	4.03	4.11	3.7
				_	_			_										
			te to what you learr		3	0	5	1	2	8	12	3.75	962/1279		3.34	4.17	4.20	3.7
			ouraged to participa		4	0	2	1	5	8		3.93	990/1270		3.32	4.35	4.42	3.9
		_	air and open discuss	sion	4	0	0	1	5	8	13	4.22	835/1269		3.76	4.35	4.41	
ł. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	stul		4	13	2	0	1	3	8	4.07	451/ 878	3.54	3.99	4.05	4.09	4.0
) Wome tr		Laborat	ory e background informa	a+i on	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	***
_	_	_	rts clearly specifie		20	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	229/ 379		3.90	4.20	4.17	
		Seminar																
5. Were cı	riteria f	for grading made	clear		20	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.06	3.42	4.01	4.12	3.0
		Field W																
5. Did cor	nferences	s help you carry	out field activitie	es	18	0	0	0	11	0	2	3.31	204/ 326	3.19	3.12	4.03	4.23	3.3
E Wara th	acro cros	Self Page program for	aced all the students		20	0	0	0	9	0	2	3.36	243/ 382	2 22	2 24	1 00	1 21	2 2
o. were u	iere enoc	igii proctors for	all the students							U	2	3.30	243/ 302	3.34	3.24	4.00	4.24	3.3
				Freque	ncy	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Gr	rades				Re	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	5 - -
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 14 0 B 9			Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99									•		, .					
56-83	8	2.00-2.99			Ger	nera.	T				0	Under-g	rad 3	31	Non-	-major	31	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3 D 0									0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0			Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ŋn
			P 0 I 0			_	ıer				_	16	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	

APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Questions

Title DASGUPTA, NANDI Instructor:

Enrollment: 86 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1532 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

		Gener	al															
		w insights,sk			0	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	359/1576	3.46	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.71
		ctor make clea			1	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	215/1576	3.55	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.82
		estions refle			0	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	191/1342	4.08	4.34	4.32	4.30	4.88
4. Did ot	ther evalu	ations reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	8	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	579/1520	3.52	4.22	4.25	4.25	4.46
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contri	bute to	what you learned	0	11	1	1	3	8	10	4.09	808/1465	3.54	3.89	4.12	4.09	4.09
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments cont	ribute t	o what you learned	0	14	2	1	1	7	9	4.00	878/1434	3.21	4.15	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was th	ne grading	system clear	ly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	228/1547	3.83	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.76
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		0	1	0	0	0	25	8	4.24	1331/1574	4.43	4.64	4.64	4.61	4.24
	_			hing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	339/1554	3.33	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.58
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectur	es well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	339/1488	3.66	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.85
		ctor seem inte			1	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	390/1493	4.20	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.94
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70			4.25	4.32	4.32	4.70
		es contribute			1	1	0	0	1	4	27	4.81			4.32	4.32		4.81
				our understanding	2		0	1	3	0	7	4.18			4.04			4.18
J. Dia ac	actovibaa	_	_	our under bearing	_	21	J	-	3	J	,	1.10	37371277	5.11	1.01	1.03		1.10
1 Did al	lass disco	Discu		what you learned	11	0	2	0	3	6	12	4 13	751/1279	2.77	3.34	4.17	4.20	4.13
				d to participate	11	0	1	3	5	5	9		1041/1270	2.79	3.32	4.35	4.42	3.78
				d open discussion	14	0	0	0	5	3	12		760/1269	3.18	3.76	4.35	4.41	4.35
		echniques succ		a open arseassion	12	14	1	0	1	1	5		****/ 878		3.99	4.05	4.09	****
4. Wele s	special te	eciniiques succ	essiui		12	14	Τ.	U			5	4.13	/ 676		3.33	4.05	4.05	
5 Were r	remuiremer	Labor	-	early specified	26	0	0	0	0	8	0	4 00	****/ 379	****	3 00	4 20	4.17	****
J. Weie i	equiremen	ics for lab re	ports Ci	earry specified	20	O	U	U	U	O	U	1.00	/ 319		3.90	1.20	1.1/	
5 Were	rriteria f	Semin for grading ma			29	0	0	0	5	0	0	3 00	****/ 375	****	3 42	4 01	4 12	****
J. Weie C	riceria i	or grading ma	de Clear		29	U	U	U	3	U	U	3.00	/ 3/3		3.42	4.01	4.12	
		Field																
5. Did co	onferences	s help you car	ry out f	ield activities	28	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 326	****	3.12	4.03	4.23	****
_	_		Paced															
5. Were t	there enou	igh proctors f	or all t	he students	20	0	0	0	12	2	0	3.14	297/ 382	2.90	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.14
				Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Тур	e			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 21		 Re	quir	 ed f	or M	 lajor		0	Graduate	· – – – – - }	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 9				_		- 5) (-
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-gr	ad 3	34	Non-	-major	34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D 0								-			-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E1.	ecti	ves				1	#### - M	leans t	here =	are not	enone	ıh
Graa.	•	3.30 1.00	P 0		THE						-	response				_	,	
				I O		0+	her				2	19	T CPPOITS	.5 CO L	o bigi	cal		
				? 0		OL.	1161											
				. 0														

Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO

Instructor: ROY, ATUL

Enrollment: 79

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1533 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	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	0	0	6	4	7	0	1		1571/1576			4.30	4.30	2.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	4	3	0		1573/1576	3.55	4.26	4.27	4.28	2.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	9	2		1265/1342	4.08	4.34	4.32	4.30	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	5	4	0		1507/1520	3.52	4.22	4.25	4.25	2.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	4	2	4		1386/1465	3.54	3.89	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	3	3	1	2		1422/1434		4.15	4.14	4.15	2.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	6	3	3		1487/1547		4.18	4.19	4.21	2.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5			987/1574		4.64	4.64	4.61	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	4	3	5	0	0	2.08	1547/1554	3.33	4.04	4.10	4.09	2.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	3	8	2	0	2.47	1477/1488	3.66	4.56	4.47	4.47	2.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	1	3	5	5	3.47	1475/1493	4.20	4.69	4.73	4.70	3.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	6	3	3	0	2.24	1481/1486	3.47	4.25	4.32	4.32	2.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	5	4	1	0	2.07	1479/1489	3.44	4.32	4.32	4.34	2.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	4	3	2	1	3	2.69	1213/1277	3.44	4.04	4.03	4.11	2.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	2	1	0	0		1277/1279			4.17	4.20	1.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	1	2	1	0		1267/1270	2.79	3.32	4.35	4.42	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	2	1	2	0		1259/1269		3.76	4.35	4.41	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 379	****	3.90	4.20	4.17	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	13	U	Ü	U	_	2	O	3.07	, 315		3.70	1.20	1.17	
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	***	3.42	4.01	4.12	***
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.12	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	1	0	5	0	0	2.67	380/ 382	2.90	3.24	4.08	4.24	2.67
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0			_		-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		

I 0 Other 14

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 62
Questionnaires: 38

ABERCROMBIE, MA Spring 2009

Page 1534 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 5 18	2 0 0 2 1	0 1 1 0	9 7 1 3	18 11 10 12 11	9 19 26 16	4.26 4.61 4.21 3.95	902/1520 933/1465	4.44 4.62 4.05 3.58	4.25 4.26 4.34 4.22 3.89	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12	4.30 4.28 4.30 4.25 4.09	3.84 4.26 4.61 4.21 3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 1 1 4	7 0 2 1	2 0 0 0	0 0 0	9 5 0 8	12 10 2 21		4.46	1105/1434 608/1547 281/1574 1081/1554	4.44 4.90	4.15 4.18 4.64 4.04	4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10	4.15 4.21 4.61 4.09	3.73 4.46 4.94 3.88
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 2 2 4	0 0 0 0 14	0 0 0 1 1	0 1 0 4 3	1 2 5 2 3	6 8 10 7 9	30 26 21 22 4		1133/1493 763/1486 955/1489	4.67 4.54 4.36	4.69 4.25 4.32	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.47 4.70 4.32 4.34 4.11	4.78 4.59 4.44 4.25 3.60
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	8 8 9 11	0 0 0 19	10 6 1 0	0 3 1 0	9 9 9 4	4 4 9 1	7 8 9 3	3.17 3.83	1207/1279 1192/1270 1012/1269 ****/ 878	2.89 3.10 3.67 ***	3.32	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.20 4.42 4.41 4.09	2.93 3.17 3.83 ****
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	218/ 379	4.06	3.90	4.20	4.17	4.06
Seminar 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37 30	0	0	0	0 7	1	0		****/ 72 ****/ 375			4.64		* * * * * * * *
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	10	0	1	3.18	227/ 326	3.28	3.12	4.03	4.23	3.18
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	14	0	1	3.13	299/ 382	3.12	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.13
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 6 C 9			quir		or M	 ajor	s	1	Graduat Under-g		0	Majo Non-	r major	1
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		El	nera ecti her				3	0 80	#### - 1 respons	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	

INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Title

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 64 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1535 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	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	3	3	10	11	4.07	1106/1576	3.96	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	476/1576	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	,	4.62	4.34	4.32	4.30	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	1	4	9	9		1179/1520		4.22	4.25	4.25	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	5	2	2	4	6		1345/1465	3.58	3.89	4.12	4.09	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	2	6	6	3		1325/1434	3.47	4.15	4.14	4.15	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	15	4.43		4.44	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	567/1574		4.64	4.64	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	5	12	3	3.81	1132/1554	3.84	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.81
T a selection														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	•	_	0.5	4 00	062/1400	4 0 4	4 56	4 45	4 45	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	263/1488	4.84	4.56	4.47	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	908/1493	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	499/1486	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	19	4.46			4.32	4.32	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	10	2	5	3.47	1033/1277	3.54	4.04	4.03	4.11	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	1	7	5	4	2 0 4	1221/1279	2.89	3.34	4.17	4.20	2.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	5	6	5 6	4		1204/1279	3.10	3.34	4.17	4.42	3.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	9	6	6		1110/1269	3.67	3.76	4.35	4.41	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	3	22	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 878	****	3.76	4.05	4.41	3.3Z ****
4. Were special techniques successiul	3	22		U			U	2.07	/ 6/6		3.33	4.05	4.09	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	3	2		****/ 379	4.06	3.90	4.20	4.17	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	6	0	3	3.50	209/ 375	3.50	3.42	4.01	4.12	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	9	0	3	3.38	195/ 326	3.28	3.12	4.03	4.23	3.38
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	8	0	1	3.10	308/ 382	3.12	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.10

Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT

Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA

Enrollment: 64
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1535 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27	-			
				?	1						

TIME SERIES DATA ANLYS

Title Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 8

Page 1536 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Questions						NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain new	v insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.25	4.30	4.46	4.63
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.00
		estions reflec			0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.34	4.32	4.46	****
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	2	2	2		1041/1520	4.00	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.00
	_			what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	1	1		1386/1465	3.00	3.89	4.12	4.22	3.00
				o what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	4		398/1434		4.15	4.14	4.30	4.50
		system clearly		ined	0	0	1	1	3	2	1		1443/1547		4.18	4.19	4.24	3.13
	-	vas class canc		hing effectiveness	0 1	0	0	0	0 1	0 6	8	5.00	1/1574 1096/1554		4.64	4.64		5.00
9. HOW WOL	iia you gr	rade the overa	II teac.	ning effectiveness	Τ	U	U	U	Τ	ь	U	3.80	1090/1554	3.80	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.80
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	5	2	4.13	1192/1488	4.13	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.13
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	2	6	4.75			4.69	4.73	4.80	4.75
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	1	4	2		1207/1486		4.25	4.32	4.41	3.88
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	0	6	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	3.34	4.17	4.31	3.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	0		1208/1270	3.00	3.32	4.35	4.53	3.00
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	1		644/1269		3.76		4.55	4.50
E Womo me		Labora	_	early specified	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4 00	229/ 379	4.00	2 00	4 20	4 10	4 00
o. were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts CI	early specified	5	U	U	U	U	3	U	4.00	229/ 3/9	4.00	3.90	4.20	4.19	4.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.42	4.01	3.90	3.00
		Field																
5 Did cor	ferences			ield activities	2	0	0	0	5	1	0	3 17	232/ 326	3 17	3 12	4 03	3 97	3 17
J. Dia coi	irer ences	ncip you carr	y out I	icia accivicios	2	O	O	O	3	_	Ü	3.17	232/ 320	3.17	3.12	1.05	3.57	3.17
		Self	Paced															
5. Were th	nere enoug	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.88	3.00
				Frequ	encv	Dis	trib	utio	n									
				1	2													
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6							ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55								`		,		-		-	-) (•	-
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	5
84-150	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0												_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
P 0													response	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0					Ot1	her					5						
				3 0														

STATISTICAL COMPUTING

Title Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1537 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	=	his course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.46	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	t the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the expec	ted goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.22	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to wha	t you learned	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1460/1465	2.00	3.89	4.12	4.22	2.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to w	hat you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.15	4.14	4.30	4.50
		system clearly		d	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.75
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.64	4.64	4.69	4.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teachin	g effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.50
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.56	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	2	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.25	4.32	4.41	4.50
4. Did the	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.32	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.04	4.03	4.04	5.00
		Discus																
1 544 41.]	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	1070/1070	1 00	2 24	1 17	1 21	1 00
		ssions contrib ts actively en			3	0	1 1	0	0	0			1279/1279 1270/1270	1.00	3.34	4.17	4.31	1.00
				pen discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0			12/0/12/0	3.00			4.55	
J. DIG CIN	e mscruc	cor encourage	rair and o	pen discussion	J	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	1210/1209	3.00	3.70	1.33	1.33	3.00
		Labora																
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts clear	ly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.90	4.20	4.19	4.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	3.42	4.01	3.90	5.00
5 Did co	nferences	Field help you carr		d activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	157/ 326	4 00	3 12	4 03	3 97	4 00
3. 214 00.	01 011000	noip you our	7 040 1101	a	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_	_	1.00	137, 320	1.00	3.11	1.05	3.77	1.00
	Free						tribu	ution	1									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	sons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	 3	0	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2									J								
56-83						Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-gr	rad	4	Non-	-major	2
84-150													3				-	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
P 0													response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0						Otl	ner					3						

Title INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA

Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1538 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
	General														
1 Did you gain new	insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ο	4	0	R	4 33	861/1576	4.33	4 25	4.30	4.46	4.33
	or make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	4		1138/1576		4.26	4.27	4.35	4.00
	stions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5			1058/1342			4.32		
_	tions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	5			614/1520				4.38	
	dings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	2	0			1102/1465				4.22	3.7
	gnments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1033/1434	3.86	4.15	4.14	4.30	3.8
	system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	480/1547	4.55	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.5
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1309/1574	4.27	4.64	4.64	4.69	4.2
9. How would you gra	ade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1187/1554	3.73	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.7
	Lecture														
1. Were the instruct	tor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.7
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.69	4.73	4.80	4.5
	rial presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2		5	3	3.75	1253/1486	3.75	4.25			
	contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	_				1005/1489		4.32		4.38	
5. Did audiovisual t	techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.04	4.03	4.04	***
	Discussion														
l. Did class discuss	sions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	3.34	4.17	4.31	3.5
2. Were all students	s actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1181/1270	3.25	3.32	4.35	4.53	3.2
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	773/1269	4.33	3.76	4.35	4.55	4.3
	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided	d with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.45	***
3. Were necessary ma	aterials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.70	* * *
. Were requirements	s for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.90	4.20	4.19	***
	Seminar														
5. Were criteria for	r grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.42	4.01	3.90	***
	Field Work														
l. Did field experie	ence contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52		****	4.48	4.70	***
5. Did conferences h	nelp you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	***	3.12	4.03	3.97	***
	Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced sy	ystem contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	***
2. Did study question	ons make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	***
3. Were your contact	ts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	* * *
4. Was the feedback	tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	***
5. Were there enough	n proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	208/ 382	3.60	3.24	4.08	3.88	3.6
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00 07 1	0.00.00.00.1														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	8	_			
				2	2						

Title DESIGN QUALITY CONTROL

Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1539 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions						NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain new	w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.46	4.33
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.83
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.46	5.00
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.22	4.25	4.38	4.50
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	738/1465	4.17	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.17
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.15	4.14	4.30	4.75
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	167/1547	4.83	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.83
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1386/1574	4.17	4.64	4.64	4.69	4.17
	-			ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.04	4.10	4.24	4.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.56	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.25	4.32	4.41	4.67
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute to	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.04	4.03	4.04	4.50
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discus	hat you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	603/1279	4.33	3.34	4.17	4.31	4.33		
2. Were a	ll student	to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	3.32	4.35	4.53	3.00		
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair and	open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	773/1269	4.33	3.76	4.35	4.55	4.33
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.33	****
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	373/ 379	3.00	3.90	4.20	4.19	3.00
_		Semina	=															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.42	4.01	3.90	3.00
5 n' 1	-	Field 1			2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2 00	051 / 206	2 00	2 10	4 02	2 05	2 00
5. Dia coi	nierences	neip you carry	y out ii	eld activities	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.12	4.03	3.97	3.00
5 Were t	here enoug	Self : gh proctors fo		e students	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	3 33	250/ 382	3 33	3 24	4 08	3 88	3 33
J. Were c	nere enoug	gir proceeds ro.	L GII CII							_	Ü	3.33	2507 502	3.33	3.21	1.00	3.00	3.33
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	рe			Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	h
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
	I 0					Oth	ner					5						
? 1																		

Course-Section: STAT 470 0101 University of Maryland Title PROB ACTUARIAL SCIENCE AYYALA, DEEPALE

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 4

Page 1540 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

					Frequencies				Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions	NR	. 1	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
	insights, skills from this course	0		0	0	0	2	1	1		1345/1576	3.75	4.25	4.30	4.46	3.75
	make clear the expected goals	0		0	0	0	1	2	1		1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.00
	ions reflect the expected goals	0		2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.34	4.32	4.46	4.00
	ions reflect the expected goals	0		3	0	0	1	0	0		1466/1520	3.00	4.22	4.25	4.38	3.00
_	ings contribute to what you learne			2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.89	4.12	4.22	4.00
9 9 1	ystem clearly explained	0		0	1	0	1	1	1		1413/1547	3.25	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.25
8. How many times was		0		0	0	0	0	4	0		1459/1574		4.64	4.64	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grad	de the overall teaching effectiver	ness 0		0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.04	4.10	4.24	3.50
1 Maria tha daratament	Lecture	0		0	0	^	0	2	-	4 05	1111/1400	4 05	4 56	4 47	4 55	4 05
1. Were the instructo	0		0	0	0	0	3	1		1111/1488	4.25	4.56	4.47	4.55	4.25	
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear 						Ţ	2	1		1411/1493	4.00	4.69	4.73	4.80	4.00
	± ±	-		0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.25	4.32	4.41	4.25
	contribute to what you learned	. 0		0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual te	echniques enhance your understand:	ing 0		3	U	0	0	U	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.04	4.03	4.04	5.00
	Laboratory															
E Ware regularements	for lab reports clearly specified	d 3		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	229/ 379	4 00	3.90	4 20	4.19	4 00
5. Were requirements	Tot lab reports clearly specified			U	U	U	U		U	4.00	229/ 3/9	4.00	3.90	4.20	4.13	4.00
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria for		2		0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	180/ 375	4.00	3.42	4.01	3.90	4.00
	J J															
	Field Work															
5. Did conferences he	elp you carry out field activities	s 2		0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.12	4.03	3.97	3.00
	o. Pra conferences mere for carri one freed acceptable															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students				0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.88	3.00
	Frequenc	уГ	Dist	ribu	tion	ı										
Goodin Books					ъ.					_				NG		
Credits Earned	ades				кеа	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors		

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

APPLIED STATISTICS I

Title

Instructor:

PARK, DO-HWAN

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1541 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55			4.25	4.30	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	891/1576	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	646/1342	4.45	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	0	7	4.09	998/1520	4.09	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1123/1465	3.73	3.89	4.12	4.25	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	836/1434	4.10	4.15	4.14	4.35	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	608/1547	4.45	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	1140/1574	4.45	4.64	4.64	4.75	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1253/1554	3.63	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	1025/1488	4.36	4.56	4.47	4.52	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	1306/1493	4.36	4.69	4.73	4.80	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	1197/1486	3.91	4.25	4.32	4.37	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1070/1489	4.09	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1047/1277	3.44	4.04	4.03	4.08	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	0	0	2		1186/1279	3.00	3.34	4.17	4.34	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	3.32	4.35	4.53	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1269	4.20	3.76	4.35	4.55	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	3.99	4.05	4.11	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 240	***	5.00	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 229	***	5.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	373/ 379	3.00	3.90	4.20	4.37	3.00
Seminar	•		_		•		_						4 50	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	371/ 375	2.50	3.42	4.01	4.10	2.50
m! 11 m 1														
Field Work	1.0	0	0	-	_	0	0	0 00	****	als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 40	4 40	ale ale ale ale
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00		****	****	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	324/ 326	2.86	3.12	4.03	4.10	2.86
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	•			_	•	_	_						4 = 0	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	***	4.60	4.50	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	381/ 382	2.60	3.24	4.08	4.13	2.60

Title APPLIED STATISTICS I

Instructor: PARK, DO-HWAN

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1541 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: STAT 612 0101 University of Maryla
Title MATHEMATICAL STAT II Baltimore County
Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1542

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera			_													
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1576			4.30	4.43	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1576	5.00		4.27	4.32	5.00
	_	estions reflec		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1342			4.32	4.38	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1520	5.00		4.25	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1465	5.00	3.89	4.12	4.25	5.00
		_		o what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1434		4.15	4.14	4.35	5.00
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1547		4.18	4.19	4.24	
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574			4.64		5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	5.00
		Lectur	٩															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture		orepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.56	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1493	5.00		4.73	4.80	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1486		4.25			
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1489		4.32			
				,									_,					
		Semina	_															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	180/ 375	4.00	3.42	4.01	4.10	4.00
		Field	i onle															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.12	4.03	4.10	3.00
		700 0000	2															
		Self																
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for	r all t	he students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	3.24	4.08	4.13	5.00
				Fred	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
					-													
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	A 2		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	. – – –	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	2		
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	в 0			1									3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.						El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ah
	P 0												respons				_	-
	I 0					Ot:	her					2	_		3			
	? 0																	

Course-Section: STAT 614 0101 University of Maryland Title

ENVIRONMENTAL STAT

Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 1543 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequenci				ncies	5		Ins	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																	
1 Did vo	u dain ne	Genera w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	527/15	76	4.58	4.25	4.30	4.43	4.58
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	<i>3</i>	-		1345/15			4.26	4.27	4.32	3.67
		estions reflec			1	0	2	3	1	4			1316/13			4.34		4.38	2.91
		ations reflect			0	2	0	2	1	5			1281/15			4.22		4.36	
				hat you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3			850/14			3.89	4.12	4.25	4.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	2			1263/14				4.14	4.35	3.40
		signments contr system clearl			0	0	4	2	3	2			1516/15				4.19	4.33	
		was class canc		.nea	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00						4.75	5.00
	_				2	0	1	1	1	7	11		1/15 1350/15				4.64 4.10		3.40
9. HOW WO	uia you g	rade the overa	II teach	ning effectiveness	2	U	Т	Τ	1	/	U	3.40	1350/15	54	3.40	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.40
		Lectur	е																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well r	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1233/14	88	4.00	4.56	4.47	4.52	4.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/14		5.00	4.69	4.73	4.80	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	7	1	3.64	1296/14				4.32	4.37	3.64
		s contribute t			0	0	1	0	3	3			1184/14		3.92		4.32		3.92
				our understanding	0	9	1	0	1	0			1149/12					4.08	
J. Dia au	aiovisaai	ceemingaes en	nance ye	ar anaciscanaing	O		_	Ü	_	O	_	3.00	1117/12	. , ,	3.00	1.01	1.05	1.00	3.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	4	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1169/12	79	3.13	3.34	4.17	4.34	3.13
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	couraged	l to participate	4	0	3	3	1	0	1	2.13	1260/12	270	2.13	3.32	4.35	4.53	2.13
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	5	0	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1242/12	69	2.71	3.76	4.35	4.55	2.71
		chniques succe		_	4	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8	78	****	3.99	4.05	4.11	****
		T = h =	.																
1 Did th	e lah ind	Labora rease understa:	-	the material	10	0	0	1	0	1	Ο	3 00	****/ 2	24	****	****	4.23	4.36	****
			_	ground information	10	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 2		****	5.00	4.35	4.37	****
				or lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 2		****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****
		tructor provid			10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 2		****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****
				early specified	9	0	0	0	1	2	0		355/ 3		3.67	3.90	4.29		3.67
5. were r	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cie	early specified	9	U	U	U	1	2	U	3.67	355/ 3	19	3.67	3.90	4.20	4.37	3.07
		Semina	r																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	232/ 3	375	3.33	3.42	4.01	4.10	3.33
		Field	Work																
1 Did fi	old owner			nat you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/	52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****
				eld activities	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	,					4.10	3.00
5. Dia co.	nrerences	neip you carr	y out II	leid activities	9	U	U	U	3	U	U	3.00	251/ 3	20	3.00	3.12	4.03	4.10	3.00
		Self	Paced																
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors fo	r all th	ne students	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	250/ 3	82	3.33	3.24	4.08	4.13	3.33
				D		- 54													
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	Cribu	ıcıoı	[]										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$				Тур	pe			Majors	3
												1					·		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ea i	or Ma	Jor	S	1	Gradu	ate	Э	7	Majo	or	3
28-55						_	_					0			,	_			_
56-83						Gei	neral	L				0	Under	-g1	rad	5	Non-	-major	9
84-150																			
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1			Means t			_	jh
	P 0									respo	nse	es to b	e sigr	ifican	ıt				
	I 0 Other						9												
				2 0															

MULTIVARIATE STAT ANAL

Title

Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1544 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			NR	NA	Fr	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General insights,skil or make clear	lls from		0	0	0	0	0	0	11 11	5.00 5.00	1/1576 1/1576	5.00 5.00	4.25 4.26	4.30 4.27	4.43 4.32	5.00 5.00
	_	stions reflect	-	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.38	5.00
		tions reflect			0	3	0	0	0	1 2	7	4.88	155/1520	4.88	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.88
	-	-		nat you learned what you learned	0	2	0	0	1 0	2	6 9	4.56 4.82	335/1465 146/1434	4.56 4.82	3.89 4.15	4.12	4.25	4.56 4.82
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.15	4.14	4.35	5.00
		as class cance		ieu	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.64	4.64	4.75	5.00
	-			ing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1554		4.04	4.10	4.18	5.00
		Lecture	e															
		tor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.56	4.47	4.52	5.00
		or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.80	5.00
		plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.25	4.32	4.37	5.00		
4. Did th	ne lectures	ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.32	4.32	4.38	5.00		
		Discus																
				nat you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.34	4.17	4.34	5.00
				to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67 ****	3.32	4.35	4.53	4.67 ****
3. Dia ti	ne instruct	or encourage	iair and	open discussion	9	0	0	0	U	0	2	5.00	****/1269	* * * *	3.76	4.35	4.55	* * * *
2 Were s	zou prozide	Laborat	-	round information	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.37	****
				arly specified	7	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	,	4.00	3.90	4.20	4.37	4.00
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	assigned to		=	announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****
	_	r grading made			5	0	0	0	6	0	0		287/ 375	3.00	3.42			3.00
		Field V	Work															
5. Did co	onferences			eld activities	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.12	4.03	4.10	3.00
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were t	there enoug	h proctors for	r all the	e students	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.13	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n											
Credits I	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	 3	0.00-0.99	 0	A 8		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	2	Graduat	 e	 5	Majo	 or	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	2411	- L	J_ 1101.		~	-	Gradact	_	-	1100	-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad.							ecti [.]	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
	P 1												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0						her					2						
? 1																		

Title BASIC MATH STAT

Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1545 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies			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	2	1	3	4	3.90	1241/1576	3.90	4.25	4.30	4.43	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1438/1576	3.40	4.26	4.27	4.32	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	1316/1342	2.89	4.34	4.32	4.38	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1392/1520	3.43	4.22	4.25	4.36	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1347/1465	3.20	3.89	4.12	4.25	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	4.15	4.14	4.35	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1432/1547	3.17	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	7		1079/1574		4.64	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2		849/1554			4.10	4.18	4.13
,	_				_	-	_		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.56	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	6		1101/1493	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	3	3		1039/1486	4.14		4.32	4.37	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	2		1035/1489	4.14	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	0	0		****/1277	****	4.04	4.03	4.08	****
5. Pia additipadi teomingaep emanet jour anderstanding	-	J	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ū	3.00	,,		1.01	1.05	1.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1229/1279	2.75	3.34	4.17	4.34	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	1	1		1208/1270	3.00	3.32	4.35	4.53	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	1	1		1210/1269	3.00	3.76	4.35	4.55	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 878	****	3.99	4.05	4.11	****
1. Here special commiques successful	Ū	_	_	Ü	Ū	_	Ü	2.50	, 0,0		3.33	1.05		
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	6	0	3.57		3.57	3.90	4.20	4.37	3.57
or more requirements for tax reports ereally specified		Ü	_	Ü	Ū	Ū	Ū	3.37	337, 375	3.37	3.70	1.20	1.57	5.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	,	2.60	3.42	4.01	4.10	2.60
5. Horo orrotta for grading made oroar		Ü	_	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	2.00	3,0, 3,3	2.00	3.12	1.01	1.10	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00		****	****	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	, -	2.50	3.12	4.03	4.10	2.50
J. Dia conferences help for carry out right detryletes		J	_	J	5	J	J	2.50	320, 320	2.50	3.12	1.05	1.10	2.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	1	0	3	0	0		382/ 382	2.50	3.24	4.08	4.13	2.50
5. Here there charge proceeds for all the beauties	9	J	_	0	J	J	0	2.50	302, 302	2.50	J. 2 I	1.00	1.10	2.50

Course-Section: STAT 653 0101 Title BASIC MATH STAT

Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1545 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: STAT 700A 0101

Title LONGITUDINAL DATA ANAL

Instructor: HUANG, YI

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1546 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	Instructor		Dept	pt UMBC Level		Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1042/1576	4.17	4.25	4.30	4.43	4.17
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	1	1	1			1138/1576			4.27		4.00
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	1	0	0			972/1342			4.32	4.38	4.00
1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	1	0	1			768/1520				4.36	4.33
		eadings contribute t		1	0	0	0	2	2			1067/1465			4.12		3.80
			to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0			270/1434			4.14		4.67
		g system clearly exp		0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1196/1547	3.83	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.83
	-	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2			911/1574				4.75	
			aching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	2			1227/1554					
		Lecture															
. Were t	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.56	4.47	4.52	4.50			
	0	0	0	0	0	1			734/1493		4.69	4.73	4.80	4.83			
		ctor seem interested terial presented and		0	0	0	1	2	0			1222/1486			4.32	4.37	
		es contribute to wha	-	0	0	0	1	1	1			1118/1489			4.32	4.38	
				0	2	0	1	0	1								
. Dia au	alovisua.	l techniques enhance	your understanding	U	2	U	Τ	U	1	۷	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.04	4.03	4.08	4.00
		Discussion		5	0												
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	0		****/1279			4.17	4.34	***
		nts actively encoura		5 5	0	0	0	0	0			****/1270			4.35	4.53	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.76	4.35	4.55	****
		Laboratory															
. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.90	4.20	4.37	****
		Seminar															
. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made cle	ar	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.42	4.01	4.10	****
		Field Work															
Did co	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.12	4.03	4.10	3.00
		Self Paced															
. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors for all	the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	***	3.24	4.08	4.13	****
			Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
		Character CDA	Demonstrad Consider				Da		_			m				Ma i assa	
Credits E	arnea	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке.	asons	∍ 				pe 			Majors 	; . – – – –
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	2	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 0		_		-					1					_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ge:	nera	Τ				3	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0											_						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 2	F 0		Electives						0	#### -					ıh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
T 0					O+.	la					1						

Other

1

0

0

I

?

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101

STAT HYPOTHESIS TESTS

Title Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1547 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5						tructor	Course	_		Level			
Questions	NR	NA			3	<u>4</u>	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	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.25	4.30	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.22	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.89	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.15	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.64	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.56	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.25	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.04	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.34	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.32	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.76	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.99	4.05	4.11	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	3.90	4.20	4.37	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.70	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	3.42	4.01	4.10	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									

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

Title TOP:MATH STAT/STAT INF

Instructor: WANG, XIAO

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1548 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.25	4.30	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.34	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.22	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.89	4.12	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.15	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.64	4.64	4.75	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.04	4.10	4.18	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.56	4.47	4.52	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		468/1486		4.25	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2		888/1489	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.04	4.03	4.08	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.90	4.20	4.37	4.00
Carrier														
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	2 00	2 42	4 01	4 10	2 00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	281/ 3/5	3.00	3.42	4.01	4.10	3.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.12	4.03	4.10	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									
Charlies Tannad Charles (D) Throughout Charles	_			Das									M	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	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	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	í
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	1						