```
Course-Section: STAT 121  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page 1527
Title     INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S              Baltimore County                                          JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   MARFANI, ERUM F                 Spring 2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     80
Questionnaires: 59                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  8 19 31  4.34   861/1576  4.23  4.25  4.30  4.11  4.34
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
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
4. Did other 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
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  13  1  1  6 11 26  4.33   571/1465  4.25  3.89  4.12  4.02  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 35  0  0  1  2 20  4.83   142/1434  4.65  4.15  4.14  3.94  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             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                   0   0  0  0  0 34 25  4.42  1177/1574  4.66  4.64  4.64  4.59  4.42
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


             Lecture
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  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  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      0   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 3 14  1  1  6 10 24  4.31   489/1277  4.38  4.04  4.03  3.91  4.31


             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 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  4.16
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 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  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  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  ****
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  ****
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
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: STAT 121  1201                University of Maryland                          Page 1528
Title       INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S            Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  KEGAN, BONNIE E                  Spring 2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  146
Questionnaires: 107                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   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 ****/  35  **** ****  4.67 4.68  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       94   6   0   0   1   2   4  4.43 ****/  28  **** ****  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
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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 enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1529
Title       STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI        Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  ABERCROMBIE, MA              Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      69
Questionnaires:  34                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies         Instructor   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  3.58 1178/1434  3.79  4.15  4.14  4.15  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   2   7   8  15  3.94 1103/1547  4.25  4.18  4.19  4.21  3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  33  4.97  141/1574  4.92  4.64  4.64  4.61  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  1   3  10   8   4  3.42 1340/1554  4.09  4.04  4.10  4.09  3.42

            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  4.15 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  3.85 1218/1486  4.31  4.25  4.32  4.32  3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   3   2   3   9  16  4.00 1118/1489  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.34  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15  5   1   6   2   4  2.94 1176/1277  3.66  4.04  4.03  4.11  2.94

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   8   4   3   7   8  3.10 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  3.10 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  3.07 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  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 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. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    33  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  80  ****  5.00  4.61  4.22  ****
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  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.40  3.92  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       33  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.73  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   33  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  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   Baltimore County   JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA   Spring 2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 69
Questionnaires: 34   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected 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   B   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
                                              P   1   responses to be significant
                                              I   0   Other   24
                                              ?   0

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0201              University of Maryland                            Page 1530
Title       STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI          Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   MARFANI, ERUM F               Spring 2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      77
Questionnaires:  40                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		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	7	9	24	4.43	757/1576	4.18	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	4.34	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	4.32	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	3.98	3.89	4.12	4.09	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	2	8	6	12	3.80	1063/1434	3.79	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	4.25	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	4.92	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	472/1277	3.66	4.04	4.03	4.11	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	2	10	4	10	3.24	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	3.36	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	3.55	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	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	2	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	****/ 379	4.03	3.90	4.20	4.17	****
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	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	2	0	0	7	0	2	3.44	****/ 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

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected 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   B   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
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   34
                                          ?   2

```
Course-Section: STAT 350  0301            University of Maryland                              Page 1531
Title           STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI    Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:     MARFANI, ERUM F           Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      52
Questionnaires:  31                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor   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  4  6  21  4.55  582/1576  4.18  4.25  4.30  4.30  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  5  6  20  4.48  638/1576  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.28  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  5  8  17  4.32  779/1342  4.32  4.34  4.32  4.30  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1  0  2  6  6  15  4.17  937/1520  4.08  4.22  4.25  4.25  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3  0  2  3  7  15  4.30  606/1465  3.98  3.89  4.12  4.09  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 1 2 2 9  9  4.00  878/1434  3.79  4.15  4.14  4.15  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  1  4  6  19  4.32  765/1547  4.25  4.18  4.19  4.21  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  1  3  26  4.83  606/1574  4.92  4.64  4.64  4.61  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 2 7 17  4.58  339/1554  4.09  4.04  4.10  4.09  4.58


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  2  3  25  4.77  484/1488  4.68  4.56  4.47  4.47  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  1  4  24  4.79  829/1493  4.55  4.69  4.73  4.70  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  2  7  21  4.63  514/1486  4.31  4.25  4.32  4.32  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  3  5  22  4.63  539/1489  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.34  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 5 1 1 3 12  3.73  909/1277  3.66  4.04  4.03  4.11  3.73


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 1 2 8 12  3.75  962/1279  3.36  3.34  4.17  4.20  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 2 1 5 8 11  3.93  990/1270  3.46  3.32  4.35  4.42  3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 5 8 13  4.22  835/1269  3.61  3.76  4.35  4.41  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  13  2  0  1  3  8  4.07  451/ 878  3.54  3.99  4.05  4.09  4.07


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.32  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 0 0 0 0 11 0 4.00  229/ 379  4.03  3.90  4.20  4.17  4.00


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               20   0  0  0 11  0  0  3.00  287/ 375  3.06  3.42  4.01  4.12  3.00


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18 0 0 0 11 0 2 3.31  204/ 326  3.19  3.12  4.03  4.23  3.31


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    20   0  0  0  9  0  2  3.36  243/ 382  3.32  3.24  4.08  4.24  3.36

                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0        0.00-0.99    1      A   14       Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55    4        1.00-1.99    0      B    9
  56-83    8        2.00-2.99    1      C    3       General               0    Under-grad  31      Non-major   31
  84-150   3        3.00-3.49    3      D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00    4      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                26
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 351  0101                   University of Maryland                              Page 1532
Title           APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO             Baltimore County                                  JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:     DASGUPTA, NANDI                    Spring 2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     86
Questionnaires: 34                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   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  8 25  4.71  359/1576  3.46  4.25  4.30 4.30 4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  6 27  4.82  215/1576  3.55  4.26  4.27 4.28 4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  4 30  4.88  191/1342  4.08  4.34  4.32 4.30 4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  8  0  0  4  6 16  4.46  579/1520  3.52  4.22  4.25 4.25 4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  8 26  4.76  228/1547  3.83  4.18  4.19 4.21 4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0 25  8  4.24 1331/1574  4.43  4.64  4.64 4.61 4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 0 11 15  4.58  339/1554  3.33  4.04  4.10 4.09 4.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  5 28  4.85  339/1488  3.66  4.56  4.47 4.47 4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  2 31  4.94  390/1493  4.20  4.69  4.73 4.70 4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  2  6 25  4.70  422/1486  3.47  4.25  4.32 4.32 4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  1  0  0  1  4 27  4.81  297/1489  3.44  4.32  4.32 4.34 4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 21 0 1 3 0 7  4.18  593/1277  3.44  4.04  4.03 4.11 4.18

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 2 0 3 6 12  4.13  751/1279  2.77  3.34  4.17 4.20 4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 3 5 5 9  3.78 1041/1270  2.79  3.32  4.35 4.42 3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 5 3 12  4.35  760/1269  3.18  3.76  4.35 4.41 4.35
4. Were special techniques successful                  12 14  1  0  1  1  5  4.13 ****/ 878  ****  3.99  4.05 4.09 ****

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26  0  0  0  0  8  0  4.00 ****/ 379  ****  3.90  4.20 4.17 ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                29  0  0  0  5  0  0  3.00 ****/ 375  ****  3.42  4.01 4.12 ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28  0  0  0  5  1  0  3.17 ****/ 326  ****  3.12  4.03 4.23 ****

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20  0  0  0 12  2  0  3.14  297/ 382  2.90  3.24  4.08 4.24 3.14
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0      A    21      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major        0
28-55      2         1.00-1.99    0      B     9
56-83     11         2.00-2.99    3      C     1      General               1     Under-grad   34      Non-major   34
84-150     5         3.00-3.49   10      D     0
Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    6      F     0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P     0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I     0      Other                29
                                         ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 351  0201                 University of Maryland                              Page 1533
Title       APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO             Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   ROY, ATUL                        Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     79
Questionnaires: 18                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   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  2.22 1571/1576  3.46  4.25  4.30  4.30  2.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   5  6  4  3  0  2.28 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  3.28 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  2.59 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  3.00 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  2.43 1422/1434  3.21  4.15  4.14  4.15  2.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   5  1  6  3  3  2.89 1487/1547  3.83  4.18  4.19  4.21  2.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  1  5 12  4.61  987/1574  4.43  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  1.40 1277/1279  2.77  3.34  4.17  4.20  1.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   6  1  2  1  0  1.80 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  2.00 1259/1269  3.18  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  2.00 ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 229  ****  5.00  4.51  4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  5.00  4.29  4.16  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  0   0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 379  ****  3.90  4.20  4.17  ****


             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  1.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  4.60  4.83  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16  0   2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83  4.89  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16  0   2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.67  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16  1   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  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
```

                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2        0.00-0.99   0      A   7        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0      B   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
                                       P   0                                    responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other              14
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 1534
Title      INTRO APP PROB & STAT             Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   ABERCROMBIE, MA                Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    62
Questionnaires:  38                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   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  0  9 18  9  3.84 1291/1576 3.96  4.25  4.30 4.30  3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  7 11 19  4.26  929/1576 4.44  4.26  4.27 4.28  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  1 10 26  4.61  480/1342 4.62  4.34  4.32 4.30  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   5  2  0  3 12 16  4.21  902/1520 4.05  4.22  4.25 4.25  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 18  1  1  1 11  5  3.95  933/1465 3.58  3.89  4.12 4.09  3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 2  0  9 12  7  3.73 1105/1434 3.47  4.15  4.14 4.15  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  5 10 22  4.46  608/1547 4.44  4.18  4.19 4.21  4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   2  0  0  0  2 33  4.94  281/1574 4.90  4.64  4.64 4.61  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0  8 21  4  3.88 1081/1554 3.84  4.04  4.10 4.09  3.88


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  1  6 30  4.78  442/1488 4.84  4.56  4.47 4.47  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  1  2  8 26  4.59 1133/1493 4.67  4.69  4.73 4.70  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  5 10 21  4.44  763/1486 4.54  4.25  4.32 4.32  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  1  4  2  7 22  4.25  955/1489 4.36  4.32  4.32 4.34  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 14 1  3  3  9  4  3.60  974/1277 3.54  4.04  4.03 4.11  3.60


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 10  0  9  4  7  2.93 1207/1279 2.89  3.34  4.17 4.20  2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0  6  3  9  4  8  3.17 1192/1270 3.10  3.32  4.35 4.42  3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 1  1  9  9  9  3.83 1012/1269 3.67  3.76  4.35 4.41  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                11  19  0  0  4  1  3  3.88 ****/ 878 ****  3.99  4.05 4.09  ****


            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 37 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  72 ****  5.00  4.64 4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              30   0  0  0  7  0  1  3.25 ****/ 375 3.50  3.42  4.01 4.12  ****


            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

                                Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0      A   13     Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0      Major        1
  28-55     5      1.00-1.99    0      B   14
  56-83    10      2.00-2.99    6      C    9     General              2    Under-grad  38      Non-major   37
  84-150    7      3.00-3.49    8      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   12      F    0     Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                              responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other               30
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 355  0301                University of Maryland                            Page 1535
Title      INTRO APP PROB & STAT              Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   ABERCROMBIE, MA                 Spring 2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     64
Questionnaires: 28                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   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  430/1342  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   3.88 1179/1520  4.05  4.22  4.25  4.25  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   5   2   2   4   6   3.21 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   3.20 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  657/1547  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  4.90  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


            Lecture
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  742/1489  4.36  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   2.84 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   6   4   3.04 1204/1270  3.10  3.32  4.35  4.42  3.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  1   3   9   6   6   3.52 1110/1269  3.67  3.76  4.35  4.41  3.52
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  22   1   0   1   1   0   2.67 ****/ 878  ****  3.99  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   3.00 ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 0 0  0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/ 229  ****  5.00  4.51  4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           27  0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/ 232  ****  5.00  4.29  4.16  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22  0   0   0   1   3   2   4.17 ****/ 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   3.00 ****/  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 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.67  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       27  0   0   1   0   0   0   2.00 ****/  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
```

                                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 417  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1536
Title       TIME SERIES DATA ANLYS          Baltimore County                                  JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  SINHA, BIMAL                    Spring 2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  471/1576  4.63  4.25  4.30  4.46  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  4  2  4.00 1138/1576  4.00  4.26  4.27  4.35  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1342  ****  4.34  4.32  4.46  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  2  2  2  4.00 1041/1520  4.00  4.22  4.25  4.38  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  1  1  2  1  1  3.00 1386/1465  3.00  3.89  4.12  4.22  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.15  4.14  4.30  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  3  2  1  3.13 1443/1547  3.13  4.18  4.19  4.24  3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.64  4.64  4.69  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  6  0  3.86 1096/1554  3.86  4.04  4.10  4.24  3.86


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  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  0  0  2  6  4.75  908/1493  4.75  4.69  4.73  4.80  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  1  4  2  3.88 1207/1486  3.88  4.25  4.32  4.41  3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  2  0  6  4.50  696/1489  4.50  4.32  4.32  4.38  4.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 1186/1279  3.00  3.34  4.17  4.31  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 1208/1270  3.00  3.32  4.35  4.53  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  644/1269  4.50  3.76  4.35  4.55  4.50


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  5   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  229/ 379  4.00  3.90  4.20  4.19  4.00


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 6   0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  287/ 375  3.00  3.42  4.01  3.90  3.00


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  2   0  0  0  5  1  0  3.17  232/ 326  3.17  3.12  4.03  3.97  3.17


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      4   0  0  0  4  0  0  3.00  313/ 382  3.00  3.24  4.08  3.88  3.00

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 433  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1537
Title       STATISTICAL COMPUTING           Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  PARK, JUNYONG                     Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires:  4                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1576  5.00  4.25  4.30  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  279/1576  4.75  4.26  4.27  4.35  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1342  5.00  4.34  4.32  4.46  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.22  4.25  4.38  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.15  4.14  4.30  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  238/1547  4.75  4.18  4.19  4.24  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00 1459/1574  4.00  4.64  4.64  4.69  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1488  5.00  4.56  4.47  4.55  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  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  2  2  4.50  678/1486  4.50  4.25  4.32  4.41  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.32  4.32  4.38  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1277  5.00  4.04  4.03  4.04  5.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1279/1279  1.00  3.34  4.17  4.31  1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1270/1270  1.00  3.32  4.35  4.53  1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1210/1269  3.00  3.76  4.35  4.55  3.00

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  229/ 379  4.00  3.90  4.20  4.19  4.00

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 375  5.00  3.42  4.01  3.90  5.00

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  1  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  157/ 326  4.00  3.12  4.03  3.97  4.00

                               Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: STAT 453  0101                 University of Maryland                                     Page 1538
Title          INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA          Baltimore County                                          JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    WANG, XIAO                       Spring 2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires:  12                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies       Instructor   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  4  0  8  4.33  861/1576  4.33  4.25  4.30 4.46  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  4  4  4  4.00 1138/1576  4.00  4.26  4.27 4.35  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  1  5  4  3.92 1058/1342  3.92  4.34  4.32 4.46  3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  0  5  4  4.44  614/1520  4.44  4.22  4.25 4.38  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  2  2  0  4  3.75 1102/1465  3.75  3.89  4.12 4.22  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 1 0 1 2 3  3.86 1033/1434  3.86  4.15  4.14 4.30  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55  480/1547  4.55  4.18  4.19 4.24  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  8  3  4.27 1309/1574  4.27  4.64  4.64 4.69  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 5 2  3.73 1187/1554  3.73  4.04  4.10 4.24  3.73

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75  505/1488  4.75  4.56  4.47 4.55  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50 1210/1493  4.50  4.69  4.73 4.80  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  2  2  5  3  3.75 1253/1486  3.75  4.25  4.32 4.41  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1  0  2  5  4     4.18 1005/1489  4.18  4.32  4.32 4.38  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/1277  ****  4.04  4.03 4.04  ****

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 1064/1279  3.50  3.34  4.17 4.31  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  1  2  0  1  3.25 1181/1270  3.25  3.32  4.35 4.53  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 0 2  4.33  773/1269  4.33  3.76  4.35 4.55  4.33

                  Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35 4.45  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 229  ****  5.00  4.51 4.70  ****
5. Were requirements 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 grading made clear                11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 375  ****  3.42  4.01 3.90  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.48 4.70  ****
5. Did conferences help 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 system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  4.60 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts 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 proctors for all the students      7   0  0  0  3  1  1  3.60  208/ 382  3.60  3.24  4.08 3.88  3.60
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99    1       A    1        Required for Majors  1      Graduate      0        Major       1
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0       B    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
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                8
                                          ?    2
```

```
                                             Frequencies       Instructor   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  2  3  4.33  861/1576  4.33  4.25 4.30 4.46 4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83  201/1576  4.83  4.26 4.27 4.35 4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1342  5.00  4.34 4.32 4.46 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2   0  0  1  0  3  4.50  511/1520  4.50  4.22 4.25 4.38 4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  2  1  3  4.17  738/1465  4.17  3.89 4.12 4.22 4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0  0  0  1  3  4.75  193/1434  4.75  4.15 4.14 4.30 4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  0  0  1  5  4.83  167/1547  4.83  4.18 4.19 4.24 4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  5  1  4.17 1386/1574  4.17  4.64 4.64 4.69 4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  1  4  4.80  160/1554  4.80  4.04 4.10 4.24 4.80

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1488  5.00  4.56 4.47 4.55 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  1  0  1  4  4.33  888/1489  4.33  4.32 4.32 4.38 4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0  0  0  1  1  4.50  309/1277  4.50  4.04 4.03 4.04 4.50

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor 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 special techniques successful                 3   2   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 878  ****  3.99 4.05 4.33 ****

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4  0   0  1  0  1  0  3.00  373/ 379  3.00  3.90 4.20 4.19 3.00

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               4   0   0  0  2  0  0  3.00  287/ 375  3.00  3.42 4.01 3.90 3.00

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 3  0   0  0  3  0  0  3.00  251/ 326  3.00  3.12 4.03 3.97 3.00

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    3   0   0  0  2  1  0  3.33  250/ 382  3.33  3.24 4.08 3.88 3.33
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 470  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1540
Title       PROB ACTUARIAL SCIENCE          Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  AYYALA, DEEPALE                  Spring 2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
Questionnaires:  4                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   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  2  1  1  3.75 1345/1576  3.75  4.25  4.30 4.46  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1138/1576  4.00  4.26  4.27 4.35  4.00
3. Did the exam questions 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
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1466/1520  3.00  4.22  4.25 4.38  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  850/1465  4.00  3.89  4.12 4.22  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 1413/1547  3.25  4.18  4.19 4.24  3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00 1459/1574  4.00  4.64  4.64 4.69  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  2  2  0  3.50 1303/1554  3.50  4.04  4.10 4.24  3.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 1111/1488  4.25  4.56  4.47 4.55  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1411/1493  4.00  4.69  4.73 4.80  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  959/1486  4.25  4.25  4.32 4.41  4.25
4. Did the lectures 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 techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1277  5.00  4.04  4.03 4.04  5.00


                 Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  229/ 379  4.00  3.90  4.20 4.19  4.00


                 Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 2   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  180/ 375  4.00  3.42  4.01 3.90  4.00


                 Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  2   0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  251/ 326  3.00  3.12  4.03 3.97  3.00


                 Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      1   0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00  313/ 382  3.00  3.24  4.08 3.88  3.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 601  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1541
Title        APPLIED STATISTICS I           Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  PARK, DO-HWAN                   Spring 2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   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  582/1576  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  3.00 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  2.50 ****/ 234  ****  ****  4.23  4.36  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.37  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 229  ****  5.00  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9   0   1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 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
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9  0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  85  ****  5.00  4.72  4.79  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  79  ****  5.00  4.69  4.77  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  72  ****  5.00  4.64  4.70  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  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


          Field Work
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 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.40  4.76  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.73  4.88  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  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


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  4.60  4.50  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83  4.80  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.67  4.33  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  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
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 601  0101              University of Maryland                    Page 1541
Title          APPLIED STATISTICS I          Baltimore County                         JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    PARK, DO-HWAN                  Spring 2009                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1       0.00-0.99   0          A   6       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      6      Major       6
 28-55    0       1.00-1.99   0          B   1
 56-83    0       2.00-2.99   0          C   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 significant
                                         I   0       Other                8
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 612  0101                University of Maryland                          Page 1542
Title     MATHEMATICAL STAT II                 Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   ROY, ANINDYA                     Spring 2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    2
Questionnaires:  2                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1576  5.00  4.25  4.30  4.43  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1576  5.00  4.26  4.27  4.32  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  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   0  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  0  2  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  2  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  2  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  2  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  0  2  5.00   1/1554  5.00  4.04  4.10  4.18  5.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  0  2  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  2  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  0  2  5.00   1/1486  5.00  4.25  4.32  4.37  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1489  5.00  4.32  4.32  4.38  5.00

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               1   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  180/ 375  4.00  3.42  4.01  4.10  4.00

                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  1   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  251/ 326  3.00  3.12  4.03  4.10  3.00

                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 382  5.00  3.24  4.08  4.13  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                     Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0        A   2         Required for Majors   0       Graduate     2         Major       2
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B   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.     2        3.50-4.00   2        F   0         Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I   0         Other                 2
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 614  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1543
Title        ENVIRONMENTAL STAT             Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  NEERCHAL, NAGAR                Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   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  3  8  4.58   527/1576  4.58  4.25  4.30  4.43  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  3  7  1  3.67  1345/1576  3.67  4.26  4.27  4.32  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  2  3  1  4  1  2.91  1316/1342  2.91  4.34  4.32  4.38  2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  2  0  2  1  5  2  3.70  1281/1520  3.70  4.22  4.25  4.36  3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  1  1  3  3  4.00   850/1465  4.00  3.89  4.12  4.25  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1  2  2  2  3  3.40  1263/1434  3.40  4.15  4.14  4.35  3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  4  2  3  2  1  2.50  1516/1547  2.50  4.18  4.19  4.24  2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1574  5.00  4.64  4.64  4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1  1  1  7  0  3.40  1350/1554  3.40  4.04  4.10  4.18  3.40


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  3  6  3  4.00  1233/1488  4.00  4.56  4.47  4.52  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1493  5.00  4.69  4.73  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  1  7  1  3.64  1296/1486  3.64  4.25  4.32  4.37  3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  1  0  3  3  5  3.92  1184/1489  3.92  4.32  4.32  4.38  3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9 1  0  1  0  1  3.00  1149/1277  3.00  4.04  4.03  4.08  3.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  0  5  1  1  3.13  1169/1279  3.13  3.34  4.17  4.34  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  3  3  1  0  1  2.13  1260/1270  2.13  3.32  4.35  4.53  2.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 2  0  4  0  1  2.71  1242/1269  2.71  3.76  4.35  4.55  2.71
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  7  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 878  ****  3.99  4.05  4.11  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   10 0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00  ****/ 234  ****  ****  4.23  4.36  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0  2  0  0  3.00  ****/ 240  ****  5.00  4.35  4.37  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 1 0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 229  ****  5.00  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            10 1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 232  ****  5.00  4.29  4.47  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   9 0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67   355/ 379  3.67  3.90  4.20  4.37  3.67


                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  9  0  0  0  2  1  0  3.33   232/ 375  3.33  3.42  4.01  4.10  3.33


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.48  4.40  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   9  0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00   251/ 326  3.00  3.12  4.03  4.10  3.00


                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       9  0  0  0  2  1  0  3.33   250/ 382  3.33  3.24  4.08  4.13  3.33


                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: STAT 615  0101                 University of Maryland                          Page 1544
Title       MULTIVARIATE STAT ANAL             Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   MATHEW, THOMAS                   Spring 2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires:  11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1576   5.00  4.25  4.30 4.43  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1576   5.00  4.26  4.27 4.32  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1342   5.00  4.34  4.32 4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  155/1520   4.88  4.22  4.25 4.36  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  335/1465   4.56  3.89  4.12 4.25  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  146/1434   4.82  4.15  4.14 4.35  4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  0 11  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 11  5.00    1/1574   5.00  4.64  4.64 4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1554   5.00  4.04  4.10 4.18  5.00

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0 11  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 11  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  0 11  5.00    1/1486   5.00  4.25  4.32 4.37  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1489   5.00  4.32  4.32 4.38  5.00

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1279   5.00  3.34  4.17 4.34  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  505/1270   4.67  3.32  4.35 4.53  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1269   ****  3.76  4.35 4.55  ****

               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 240   ****  5.00  4.35 4.37  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7   0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00  229/ 379   4.00  3.90  4.20 4.37  4.00

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85   ****  5.00  4.72 4.79  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 5   0  0  0  6  0  0  3.00  287/ 375   3.00  3.42  4.01 4.10  3.00

               Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  8   0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00  251/ 326   3.00  3.12  4.03 4.10  3.00

               Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      9   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 382   ****  3.24  4.08 4.13  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: STAT 653  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page 1545
Title      BASIC MATH STAT                      Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   SINHA, BIMAL                      Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires: 10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank       Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  2  1  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  4.50 1079/1574   4.50  4.64  4.64  4.75  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  5  2  4.13  849/1554   4.13  4.04  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  4.63 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  4.14 1039/1486   4.14  4.25  4.32  4.37  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0  0  1  4  2  4.14 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  3.00 ****/1277   ****  4.04  4.03  4.08  ****

            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  3.00 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  3.00 1210/1269   3.00  3.76  4.35  4.55  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2   1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 878   ****  3.99  4.05  4.11  ****

            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  2.00 ****/ 240   ****  5.00  4.35  4.37  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 229   ****  5.00  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 232   ****  5.00  4.29  4.47  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3   0   1  0  0  6  0  3.57  359/ 379   3.57  3.90  4.20  4.37  3.57

            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  1.00 ****/  72   ****  5.00  4.64  4.70  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  80   ****  5.00  4.61  4.70  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0   1  0  4  0  0  2.60  370/ 375   2.60  3.42  4.01  4.10  2.60

            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 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.40  4.76  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       9   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  44   ****  ****  4.73  4.88  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   9   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  45   ****  ****  4.57  4.65  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6   0   1  0  3  0  0  2.50  326/ 326   2.50  3.12  4.03  4.10  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  1.00 ****/  28   ****  ****  4.78  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     6   0   1  0  3  0  0  2.50  382/ 382   2.50  3.24  4.08  4.13  2.50
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 653  0101                  University of Maryland                      Page 1545
Title          BASIC MATH STAT                   Baltimore County                          JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    SINHA, BIMAL                        Spring 2009                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:  10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons               Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0          0.00-0.99   0        A    2         Required for Majors  0      Graduate    5       Major       8
  28-55     0          1.00-1.99   0        B    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 be significant
                                            I    0         Other                7
                                            ?    3
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | 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	1	0	4	4.17	1042/1576	4.17	4.25	4.30	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	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	1	0	1	4	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.22	4.25	4.36	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	3.89	4.12	4.25	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.15	4.14	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1196/1547	3.83	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.64	4.64	4.75	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.04	4.10	4.18	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.56	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1222/1486	3.83	4.25	4.32	4.37	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.04	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	****	3.34	4.17	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	3.32	4.35	4.53	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.76	4.35	4.55	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.90	4.20	4.37	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.42	4.01	4.10	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences 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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	4	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0			Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	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	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101                  University of Maryland                                Page 1547
Title          STAT HYPOTHESIS TESTS            Baltimore County                                     JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    PARK, JUNYONG                    Spring 2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires: 1                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  1  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 4.00 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 5.00    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 5.00    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
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0        A    1       Required for Majors  1     Graduate      1      Major       1
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0        B    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 there are not enough
                                           P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                0
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: STAT 710  0101               University of Maryland                          Page 1548
Title         TOP:MATH STAT/STAT INF           Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   WANG, XIAO                          Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  3                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   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  4.67   468/1486  4.67  4.25  4.32  4.37  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   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


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                2   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00   287/ 375  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


                                          Frequency Distribution

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